00067817

NOT TO BE ISSUED OUT
WITHOUT PERMISSION.

BOMBAY BRANCH

OF THE

Royal Asiatic Society.

Digitized with financial assistance from
Hemendra Kothari
on 06 November, 2019

The International Theological Library.

EDITED BY

STEWART D. F. SALMOND, D.D.,

Professor of Systematic Theology and New Testament Exegesis, Free Church College, Aberdeen;

AND

CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D.,

Edward Robinson Professor of Biblical Theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

CHRISTIAN INSTITUTIONS.

By ALEXANDER V. G. ALLEN, D.D.

THE INTERNATIONAL THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

THE following eminent Scholars have contributed, or are engaged upon, the Volumes named:—

An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament.	By S. R. DRIVER, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. [*Sixth Edition.*
Christian Ethics.	By NEWMAN SMYTH, D.D., Pastor of the First Congregational Church, New Haven, Conn. [*Third Edition.*
Apologetics.	By A. B. BRUCE, D.D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis, Free Church College, Glasgow. [*Third Edition.*
History of Christian Doctrine.	By G. P. FISHER, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [*Second Edition.*
A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age.	By ARTHUR CUSHMAN MCGIFFERT, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Church History, Union Theological Seminary, New York. [*Just published.*
Christian Institutions.	By A. V. G. ALLEN, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass. [*Just published.*
Theology of the Old Testament.	By A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Hebrew, New College, Edinburgh.
An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament.	By S. D. F. SALMOND, D.D. Professor of Systematic Theology and New Testament Exegesis, Free Church College, Aberdeen.
Old Testament History.	By H. P. SMITH, D.D., late Professor of Hebrew, Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Theology of the New Testament.	By GEORGE B. STEVENS, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of New Testament Criticism and Interpretation in Yale University, U.S.A.
The Christian Pastor.	By WASHINGTON GLADDEN, D.D., Pastor of Congregational Church, Columbus, Ohio.
Canon and Text of the New Testament.	By CASPAR RENÉ GREGORY, Ph.D., Professor in the University of Leipzig.
The Latin Church.	By ARCHIBALD ROBERTSON, D.D., Principal of King's College, London.
The Ancient Catholic Church.	By ROBERT RAINY, D.D., Principal of the New College, Edinburgh.
Encyclopædia.	By C. A. BRIGGS, D.D., Professor of Biblical Theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York.
Contemporary History of the Old Testament.	By FRANCIS BROWN, D.D., Professor of Hebrew and Cognate Languages, Union Theological Seminary, New York.
Contemporary History of the New Testament.	By FRANK C. PORTER, Ph.D., Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Philosophy of Religion.	By ROBERT FLINT, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh.
The Study of the Old Testament.	By HERBERT E. RYLE, D.D., President of Queens' College, Cambridge.
Rabbinical Literature.	By S. SCHECHTER, M.A., Reader in Talmudic in the University of Cambridge.
The Life of Christ.	By WILLIAM SANDAY, D.D., LL.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

INTERNATIONAL THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

CHRISTIAN INSTITUTIONS

BY

ALEXANDER V. G. ALLEN, D.D.

PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN THE EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL IN CAMBRIDGE

AUTHOR OF "THE CONTINUITY OF CHRISTIAN THOUGHT," "LIFE OF JONATHAN EDWARDS," "RELIGIOUS PROGRESS," ETC.

67817

A-9-10

ROY. LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ASIATIC SOCIETY.

EDINBURGH
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET
1898

260
All/chr
67817
2nd
238

PRINTED BY

MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED.

NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

TORONTO: THE WILLARD TRACT DEPOSITORY.

PREFACE

THIS treatise is a summary of the church's history from the point of view of its institutions. The effort has been made to show how organization, creeds, and cultus are related to the spiritual life and to the growth of Christian civilization. The field covered by the title, *Christian Institutions*, is so large that the selection of the subjects to be treated, and the proportion of space assigned to each, must reflect to some extent the personality of the author, obliging him to tell what connected impressions he has gained from the wide survey. Otherwise the work would become a small dictionary of Christian antiquities, or a series of brief imperfect monographs. Hitherto no attempt has been made in a formal manner to study the institutions of Christianity with reference to their mutual relationships. Even the term 'Institutions' requires to be defined. Its expansion to cover creeds and doctrines, as well as organization and ritual, must be justified by that growing use of the word which makes it include the prominent features of the church, its rules of procedure, habits of action, or those related facts regulating its conduct in the attainment of its end.

The work was begun some five years ago, when, through the kindness of Augustus Lowell, Esq., it took shape as a course of Lowell Lectures. Its preparation for the press was soon after interrupted, and three years elapsed before it was again resumed, under a sense of pressure in conse-

quence of the long delay. To make such a work as this complete is in the nature of the case impossible. But it may serve to call attention to a method of dealing with the subject wherein the dispassionate attempt is made to penetrate the meaning of usages that seem irrational because familiarity has dimmed our vision, or an inward repugnance prevented our doing the justice for which they plead and wait.

To the Rev. Henry J. W. Allen of Glen Loch, Pennsylvania, to Professor P. H. Steenstra, D.D., of Cambridge, and to the Rev. Arthur N. Peaslee of Cambridge, my thanks are given for valuable aid in revising proof-sheets and for many important suggestions.

CONTENTS

BOOK I

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCH

CHAPTER I

PAGES

HISTORICAL SURVEY 5-20

The organization of the church, not the result of accident, but reflects deep motives in the Christian life or in Christian civilization. The origin of the Christian ministry a matter of controversy in the sixteenth century. The attitude of Jerome, who denied the 'divine right' of episcopacy, and maintained that the elevation of the bishop above the presbyter was an ecclesiastical arrangement. The statement of Jerome incorporated in the Canon Law of the Roman church. To this statement the appeal was made in the age of the Reformation. The English Reformers influenced by it, as well as the Puritans. Hence the caution and moderation of the tone of the English Reformers. A change in the Church of England toward the close of the century, and episcopacy by 'divine right' asserted by Bancroft, and by Hall, who sought to overcome the force of Jerome's influence. The Puritans in reply maintained the statement of Jerome, and identified bishops and presbyters in the Apostolic age. Jeremy Taylor the first to maintain that Apostles were orginally bishops, but not known by that title. In the sixteenth century Anglicans had held that the form of church government was not prescribed by Scripture, while Puritans held that Presbyterianism was of divine appointment. In the seventeenth century these attitudes reversed, Anglicans maintaining episcopacy by 'divine right,' while Puritans took Hooker's ground, that the form was a matter of indifference. The discovery of the Shorter Greek Recension of the Ignatian Epistles as giving a new direction to the controversy, but leading to no results. A new impulse given to the discussion in the nineteenth century by the application of the principle of historical development. Theories of the origin of the episcopate maintained by Rothe and by Baur. Contribution to the inquiry by Ritschl. Renan's contention that ecclesiastical organization was influenced by secular models. The important service rendered by Bishop Lightfoot in vindicating the genuine-

PAGES

ness of the Ignatian Epistles and in other ways. Dr. Hatch questioned Jerome's statement, which Lightfoot had approved, that 'bishop' and 'presbyter' were at first synonymous terms. Dr. Harnack demonstrates that the office of 'bishop' was from the first distinct from that of 'presbyter.' The discovery of the Didache furnishes the missing link between the Apostolic age and the time of Ignatius.

CHAPTER II

APOSTLES, PROPHETS, TEACHERS 21–36

Ignorance of the date of the New Testament writings makes exact statement impossible in regard to changes of organization, but the difficulty in a measure overcome by classifying these writings according to generations. In the first Christian generation, the writings of St. Paul furnish the authoritative account of the ministry. It was divided into two ranks: the higher, including Apostles, prophets, and teachers; and the lower, or local administrative offices. The first and only mention of bishops is in the Epistle to the Philippians, where there is more than one bishop in the community. The account of St. Paul in harmony with that given in the early part of the Acts of the Apostles. The Twelve and the appointment of the Seven illustrate the higher and the lower grades of the ministry, — the ministry of the Word, and the ministry of the tables. The connection of the Seven with the later diaconate. The prophets occupy the second place in the higher grade. Distinction between Apostles and prophets. The office of the teacher. These three classes of officers constituted a ministry at large, and were not localized. Their separate functions might be united in one man, as in the case of St. Paul. The Apostolate as limited to the Twelve. The larger Apostolate, which included St. Paul and many others. How far the larger Apostolate had been eye-witnesses of the Resurrection. The labors of St. Paul as an Apostle. Slight information regarding the Apostolic activity of the Twelve. Appointment to the larger Apostolate; in the case of St. Paul, through the agency of prophets and teachers. On this larger Apostolate, and not exclusively on the Twelve, the church was built as a foundation, together with the prophets, and Christ as the Corner Stone.

CHAPTER III

PRESBYTERS, BISHOPS, DEACONS 37–45

The first generation of the Apostolic age followed by the age of the elders or presbyters. The prominence of the presbyters disclosed in the New Testament writings of the second generation. The list of officers given in the Epistle to the Ephesians. Use of the terms 'evangelist,' 'pastor,' ἡγούμενοι. Light thrown by the

PAGES

Pastoral Epistles. The qualifications of the bishops, and their relation to the presbyters. Whether there was a plural episcopate or a single bishop in the church at Ephesus. The presbyterate, as it appears in the Second and Third General Epistles of St. John.

CHAPTER IV

THE AGE OF TRANSITION 46–60

To the third generation belong the Epistle of Clement of Rome, the Didache, the Shepherd of Hermas, and the Ignatian Epistles. General characteristics of Clement's epistle. The list of church officers enumerated. The burden of his message, that all things should be done in order. His comparison of the Christian ministry to the Jewish priesthood. The doctrine of the transmission of authority through verbal commission. How far his teaching is sanctioned by the New Testament. Contention in regard to the episcopal office and how it is to be overcome. The exact nature of the disturbance at Corinth is not made apparent. The episcopate as a life office. Four grades of officers in the Roman church, when Clement wrote, and the episcopate a plural one. In the Shepherd of Hermas, the officers of the church are prophets, teachers, presbyters, bishops, and deacons. The interest of Hermas centres in the prophets. The Didache alludes to Apostles, prophets, and teachers as still the officers of the church, but they are on the eve of vanishing. The prophet may be settled in a community, or bishops (the plural episcopate) and deacons may be appointed as a substitute by the congregation. There is no mention of the presbyter, but bishops and deacons are coupled together, as in the Pastoral Epistles, in the Epistle of Clement, and in the Shepherd of Hermas.

CHAPTER V

THE IGNATIAN EPISCOPATE 61–71

Date of the Ignatian writings. Apostles, prophets, and teachers have disappeared. The object of Ignatius is to exalt the episcopate, but not to depreciate the presbyterate. Obedience is enjoined to the threefold order, — bishops, presbyters, and deacons. The chief stress laid upon submission to the bishop as standing in the place of God. The presbyters are always represented as successors of the Apostles, and in this respect Ignatius is in harmony with New Testament precedents. The connection of the bishop with the Eucharist a vital one in Ignatius' mind. No importance attached to tradition, or to Apostolic authority in urging obedience to the bishop; but the authority of Ignatius is a direct message from the Spirit. His silence regarding the order of prophets difficult to explain. His scheme a transcendental one. The character of Ignatius and of the time as throwing light upon his teaching.

CHAPTER VI

PAGES

THEORIES REGARDING THE ORIGIN OF THE EPISCOPATE . . 72–86

(1) The government of the church varied in different places and at different times in the same place. But beneath the variations there was principle and unity. (2) The position of James, the Lord's brother, in the church at Jerusalem as a witness to the Apostolic origin of the episcopate. But this position was exceptional, resting on a peculiar basis, and constituting a peculiar type, neither of which were followed in the Ignatian episcopate. (3) The episcopate arose by the localization of the Apostolate. The evidence for this is lacking; the calling of an Apostle incongruous with his settlement. The cases of Peter and John. The silence of the Ignatian Epistles. The Apostle not the prototype of the bishop. (4) That presbyter and bishop are names used as synonyms in the New Testament, and that the episcopate was formed out of the presbyterate by elevation. Grounds on which this theory has been questioned and rejected. Presbyters always mentioned by themselves, and where thus mentioned no allusion is made to bishops and deacons. Significance of the association of bishops with deacons; both were connected with the administration of the Eucharist. The bishop was the financial officer of the local community, to which, in connection with his relation to the Eucharist, he owed his prominence in the local community. Growing importance of the Eucharist in the second century furnishes a clew to the elevation of the bishop above the presbyter. The function of the presbyter was changing. He was originally the bearer of the tradition, but the appearance of the Rules of Faith and of the Canon of the New Testament rendered this function superfluous. No complete picture of the situation can yet be formed, but the outline is clear. The significance of the elevation of the bishop lies in giving the foremost place to the administration of ecclesiastical affairs.

CHAPTER VII

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY IN THE SECOND CENTURY . . 87–106

At the beginning of the century the bishop was presented as the successor of Christ; at the end of the century he had become the successor of the Apostles. Explanation of the change. The presbyter at first presented as the successor of the Apostles. Why the presbyter lost this position. The change was owing to the necessity of overcoming the heretics, who appealed to the tradition. To meet the Gnostics was one object in the formation of the Canon, and of the Rules of Faith, of which the bishop became the official curator. The presbyter was no longer needed as a witness to the tradition. Illustrations of the situation in the utterances of Papias, of Hegesippus, and in the writings of Irenæus. Why Irenæus seems to use the names 'presbyter' and 'bishop' as synonymous.

PAGES

Theory of Irenæus regarding the Apostolical succession. Tertullian's presentation of the subject in his Prescription of Heretics; his theory of Apostolical succession. The change in the presbyter's office completed by the end of the second century. The bishop had absorbed the presbyter's function, which had then become a purely administrative one, and to the presbyter was assigned a share in the bishop's original function of administering the Eucharist. In the time of Tertullian, the larger Apostolate had been forgotten, and the name of Apostle was limited to the Twelve, with the exception of St. Paul. The passing of the prophets. Montanism, an effort to restore the office; conflict between the bishops and the prophets. The ideal of the episcopate as compared with the mission of the prophets. The rise of the Catholic church, and its struggle with Montanism. Weakness in the Montanist conception of prophecy. The transition of Tertullian from the Catholic church to the Montanists, an illustration of the movements of the age. Prophecy was condemned and banished, but the settlement of the second century not a final one. Effect of the suppression of prophecy. The office of the Reader, the last relic of the ancient prophetic order.

CHAPTER VIII

THE AGE OF CYPRIAN 107–136

The bishop, hitherto the pastor of the local church, begins to pass over into the diocesan bishop. Explanation of the change. Rivalry and conflict between bishops and presbyters. Cyprian held the Roman theory of the transmission of power. The question of ordination became, in consequence, of the highest importance. Belief that the Holy Spirit was imparted by ordination in contrast with the earlier conviction that the antecedent action of the Spirit justified ordination. Instances of ordination in the New Testament. Significance of the laying on of hands. Prophets and teachers received no ordination. No mention of the ordination of bishops in the New Testament. Absence of allusion to the method of ordination in writings of the second century; Clement of Rome, the Didache, the Epistles of Ignatius, are silent as to the mode of making presbyters and bishops. The ordination of a bishop in the Apostolic Ordinances; in the Clementine writings; according to the Canons of Hippolytus; in the church at Alexandria. Cyprian's rule for making a bishop. The power invested in the bishops of the province, and no longer in the congregation. The bishops, according to Cyprian, constitute the church. His theory of Apostolical succession. Ordinations by presbyters forbidden. The principle adopted that no ordination was valid without the co-operation or sanction of the bishop. Traces of an earlier usage. Distinctions among the bishops. The later type of bishop first developed in the great cities. Cyprian vindicates the equality

PAGES

of the bishops, but his conception of the ministry deepens the separation between clergy and laity. The Christian ministry is transformed into a priesthood after Jewish analogies. Hence followed the necessity of altar and sacrifice. Cyprian's theory of Apostolical succession compared with earlier theories. Growth of the metropolitan bishops. Efforts to increase the dignity of the episcopate. Relation of church and state. Cyprian's attitude provoked the resistance of the state. Significance of the rise of priesthoods. The Decian and Diocletian persecutions. The coming of Constantine and the changed relations of the church to the state. Peculiarities of Cyprian's conception of the episcopate in contrast with the original motive of the office. Cyprian a Montanist at heart; he endeavored to combine Montanism and Catholicity, with a result that was impracticable and intolerable. Difference in attitude and circumstances between the Eastern and Western episcopates.

CHAPTER IX

MONASTICISM IN ITS RELATION TO THE EPISCOPATE AND TO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH 137–178

The episcopate had found its opportunity in the city. Monasticism was a return to the country. The praise of solitude by Jerome. In its origin, monasticism was indifferent, if not averse, to the Catholic church, its priesthood and sacraments. Its keynote on its ecclesiastical side was the dictum of Jerome that in the beginning of Christ's religion the bishop and presbyter were of equal authority. Relation of Jerome to the bishops. That monasticism may be regarded as the continuation of the Montanist purpose is shown by their common features. Montanism, Novatianism, Donatism, Monasticism, constitute the line of succession. The Catholic church stood for solidarity, monasticism for the principle of individualism. The Catholic church was too strong to be overcome by the monastic movement, nor could the latter be suppressed as Montanism had been. In the compromise which was effected, the Eastern church succeeded in placing the monasteries under episcopal control, but its bishops were henceforth taken from the monasteries. Results of this compromise. In the West, the Eastern system of patriarchates and metropolitans had not been developed, and under this looser organization a greater opportunity was afforded to monasticism. The papacy was a compromise between the episcopate and the monastery, leaning more to the monastic interpretation of life than to the secular as represented by the bishop. The alliance between the papacy and monasticism, first seen in Gregory the Great, was more fully realized under Hildebrand. In mediating between the episcopate and monasticism, the papacy fulfilled its highest function. To the monastery and not to the bishop is chiefly owing the conversion of Western Europe. In the intellectual development, the monks

PAGES

took the lead. Among them are also to be found the greatest saints. Equally important is their relation to the development of civilization. The contrast between early monasticism and its later forms. The secret of its history and of its success is what we know as individualism, for which the Catholic church had made no provision under the episcopate. The struggle between the bishops and the monasteries, or between the 'secular' and 'religious' sides of the Mediæval church. In its first phase, the secular won, and the monks were enrolled in the clerical order. In the next stage, the monasteries were emancipated from episcopal control. The monastery won another victory when celibacy was enforced on the clergy. The bishops gave no support to Hildebrand when he began his attack on the married clergy. The attempt of monasticism to enforce poverty on the secular clergy ended in failure, and with this failure Monasticism reached its limit and entered on its decline. Other causes for its decline. In what ways it had ministered to its higher purpose. The survival of its spirit. How the monastic organization was affected by the decline and fall of the papacy. The monastic presbyter was then left free with no episcopal authority which could command his obedience. The secular clergy took the vow of obedience to the bishop, the monastic clergy to the presbyter-abbot. This circumstance exerted its influence on the organization of the Protestant churches. The worship, also, of the monasteries was of a different type from that which was cultivated by the episcopate in the parish churches.

CHAPTER X

THE GREEK CHURCH — NATIONALITY AND THE EPISCOPATE . 179–201

It was one function of the episcopate in the Middle Ages to minister to the growth of the national consciousness. The bishop became an officer of the state, and for this task was fitted by the peculiar characteristics of his office. The monkish clergy indifferent to the welfare of the state. The secular tendency inherent in the episcopate. National rivalries in the East. Their influence in ecclesiastical controversies. Rivalry between Rome and Constantinople. Effect of these national jealousies and antipathies on Catholic unity. Schism between the Greek and Latin churches. Condemnation of Roman usages at the Second Trullan Council. The charges against Rome preferred by Photius, the Patriarch of Constantinople. The Azymite heresy. Further alienation of the two churches in the Image-worship Controversy. Connection between East and West a nominal one since the fall of the Western Empire in 476. What significance is to be attached to that date. Charlemagne's coronation further separates the churches. The principle of Catholic unity as illustrated in the Eastern church.

CHAPTER XI

PAGES

THE EPISCOPATE AND THE PAPACY 202–230

The process in Gaul by which the bishop made the transition from being the pastor of the local church to the ruler of a large diocese. The bishops became important personages. Their relations to the Merovingian monarchs. Question raised as to their appointment. Decline of the episcopate in the seventh century. The reform came from the monastery. The process began of subjecting the episcopate to the papacy. Revival of the metropolitan office under Charlemagne. The Capitulary of Frankfort. The effort of the bishops to escape from the control of metropolitans. The Forged Decretals; their motive and their result. Tendency of the episcopate toward alliance with the sovereigns. A secular tendency existed in the office from its first appearance. The work of the bishops in the Middle Ages, of a twofold character, to represent the church to the state, and to adapt religion to the masses of the peoples. Their work a successful one. The papacy indifferent to nationality. Lack of the national patriarchate. Hildebrand's aim to subordinate nationality to imperialism. The Investiture Controversy. The bishops incline to support the secular authority. Illustrations in Germany, France, and England. Results of the Investiture Controversy. The growth of nationality facilitated by the union of the episcopate with the crown. Theory of relationship of the episcopate to the papacy. The bishops fail the pope in the effort to exterminate heresy. The monasteries furnish the tribunal of inquisition. The crusade against the Albigenses. The bishops in sympathy with the crown in the conflict with Boniface VIII. Great value of the work done by the episcopate in the Middle Ages. The Council of Constance and the assertion of the principle of nationality. Decline of the Roman principle of Catholicity.

CHAPTER XII

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCHES IN THE AGE OF THE REFORMATION 231–278

The Reformers did not break up the unity of Christendom. The revolution had been accomplished before they appeared. The changes of the sixteenth century governed by the law of development. The Reformers did not aim at external unity, but assumed the unity of the Spirit as actual, although invisible. They rejected the Latin theory of Catholicity. The claims of papacy, episcopacy, and presbytery as presented at the Council of Constance. The Franciscans a type of ecclesiastical organizations in the age of the Reformation. The Brothers of the Common Life. Influence of the monastery on the Reformation in Germany. The New Testament was substituted for tradition as the supreme authority. In-

PAGES

fluence of this conviction upon human arrangements. Change in the conception of the presbyter's functions. Return of prophecy. Its relation to reform. It possesses a corrective lacking in the second century. The return of the teacher. Alliance between prophecy and learning in Germany. Cranmer and Calvin. Change in the idea of the church. The changed conception of ordination. Influence of the monastery in the elevation of the presbyterate. The episcopal and presbyterial vows. Qualifications for the presbyterate. The bishops as the defenders of the faith. Value of their tradition in the eyes of the Reformers. Influence of the doctrine of Justification by Faith, in overcoming the corruptions of the Mediæval church. Why the episcopate was retained in England and Sweden, and rejected in Germany, Scotland, Denmark, and the Netherlands. The situation in Geneva. The influence of Jerome's statement. Every country was free to choose its form of ecclesiastical organization. Presbyters led the Reformation in Germany, in Switzerland, in Scotland; but in England and Sweden it was led by the crown with the acquiescence of the episcopate. Influence of nationality upon the retention of the episcopate. Countries converted by monastic agency abandoned the episcopate. The situation in England. The principles of Wycliffe. The English Reformation developed bishops as leaders. How the English church treated the monasteries, and the consequence of this treatment in its later history. Nonconformity in England. The larger bearing of the issue between episcopacy and presbytery. Analogy in Jewish history. The title 'Protestant' not the antithesis of 'Catholic.' How the Protestant Reformers defined Catholicity. The use of 'Catholic' in the creeds. Resemblances between the Protestant churches and the greater monastic orders of the Latin church. The evils of Protestantism as compared with its advantages and its blessings.

BOOK II

THE CATHOLIC CREEDS AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF DOCTRINE

CHAPTER I

THE CATHOLIC CREEDS 279–294

The Apostles' Creed; time and place of its origin. Whether it was a protest against Docetism. The Rule of Faith given by Ignatius. The Apostles' Creed as the expansion of the baptismal formula. Its historical character. Not known in the Eastern church till the time of Origen. His commentary upon it. The Eastern Creeds: Creed of Gregory Thaumaturgus; of the church in Cæsarea; the Nicene Creed; Creed of the Church in Jerusalem; its later en-

PAGES

largement as presented to the Council of Constantinople in 381; its approval by the Council at Chalcedon in 451, and its substitution for the Nicene Creed. The enlargement of the Roman or Apostles' Creed in the eighth century. Comparison of the Apostles' and Nicene creeds. The controversial character of the Nicene Creed.

CHAPTER II

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY — ITS PLACE IN HISTORY AND ITS RELATION TO HUMAN PROGRESS 295–332

The formula of the Trinity grew out of the divine name given in the baptismal formula. The triune name as corresponding to the large divisions of religious experience. The religion of nature, the religion of humanity, the religion of the inner life. The doctrine of the Trinity alone among Christian doctrines created no incurable schism. The whole church contributed to its development: Ebionitism, Gnosticism, and Montanism. Patripassianism. The theory of emanation. Relation of the doctrine to Greek philosophy. The formula of the *Homoüsion*. Arianism as an interpretation of the relation of church and state. Opposition of the Roman emperors to the Nicene Creed. Its final proclamation by Theodosius, as the Catholic faith. The relation of the *Homoüsion* to the elevation and dignity of man. The teaching of Athanasius. His conflicts with the Empire. Relation of the *Homoüsion* to the rise of monasticism. Its influence in Gaul. Hilary of Poitiers. Arianism among the barbarians, and the reason for its espousal by them. The *Homoüsion* becomes the supreme issue of the rising civilization. Gregory of Tours and his conversations with Arians. The addition of the *filioque* to the Nicene Creed. The so-called Athanasian Creed. Time and place of its origin. Its identification of the Catholic faith with the doctrine of the Trinity. Its damnatory clauses. As a war-cry against Mohammedanism. The growth of freedom in Gaul. The Protestant Reformers retain the three creeds. In holding to the Trinity, they remained within the pale of the Catholic church. The *Homoüsion*, the social compact on which church and state reposed. The Reformers were aware of its significance and gave it the foremost place in their Confessions of Faith. The case of Servetus.

CHAPTER III

THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MIRACLE . . . 333–345

What is meant by Historical Christianity. The importance assigned to the miracle in the Apostles' Creed. Comparison in this respect with the early Eastern creeds. Definition of the miracle varies in the two churches. Faith as related to the miracle.

PAGES

Results of the miracle upon the idea of God and the freedom of man. It stands in opposition to the nature-worships. Its prominence in Christianity, and its rejection by Buddhism and Islam has a deep significance. The miracle in the Middle Ages. Its relation to the development of the natural sciences.

CHAPTER IV

THE LIFE OF THE SPIRIT — THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT — THE RELATION OF THE DIVINE TO THE HUMAN . . 346–381

The silence of the Catholic creeds, and its explanation. They represent the popular form of Christianity as represented by the episcopate or the 'secular' clergy in contrast with the monastery, where scientific theology had its development. The coming of Augustine, and its significance for the inner life of thought and experience. Individualism and its relation to theological inquiry. The doctrine of atonement not contained in the creeds, but is prominent in Protestant Confessions of Faith. How far the doctrine was recognized in the ancient church, and the shape which it took. Ignorance the source of the evil from which man is delivered. Identification of humanity with Christ. The theory of a ransom paid to Satan found in Origen and the later Greek Fathers, but not as their higher thought. Divergence between the Greek and Latin churches regarding the idea of God and the nature of man. Augustine the first to identify the Catholic church with the kingdom of God. Change from Platonism to Aristotelianism. In the West, God was conceived in His essence as will; herein lies the explanation of the Latin conception of the church and of the papacy, and of the later Augustinian theology. Augustine held the doctrine that a ransom was paid to Satan, but it was not his complete thought. A great advance when Anselm taught that the ransom was paid to God. By his doctrine of atonement Anselm overcomes in principle the idea of God as absolute will on which the papacy rested. Later theories of atonement in the Latin church. Comparison between Calvinism and Augustinianism. The doctrine of atonement in recent Protestant writers. The principle of the Fatherhood of God. Dr. Bushnell's speculations on the subject. The value of the altar language. Controversy regarding the Two Natures. Nestorianism. Cyril's conception of the relation of the divine and human. The decision of Council of Chalcedon. Deficiencies of the controversy. The principle at issue reappears in modern controversies regarding the divine and the human element in Scripture. Dangers of fusing the human with the divine.

CHAPTER V

PAGES

THE PERSON OF CHRIST IN MODERN THOUGHT—DIFFICULTY WITH THE MIRACLE—ANGLICAN AND GERMAN THEOLOGY . 382–398

The stress of modern inquiry has been placed on the moral character of Christ. Christ is conceived after the analogy of the teacher who permeates humanity by his spiritual influence. The word 'teacher' as applied to Christ in the New Testament. Difficulty of reconciling this conception of Christ with the miracle. Causes of the modern repugnance to the miracle. Resistance to the miracle does not imply its rejection. Rothe's view of the miracle. The Protestant churches, while accepting the creeds, vary in their interpretation of them. There is no necessary opposition between the creeds and the theologies. The doctrine-histories, as supplanting the older method of producing systems of theology. The distinction between creed and doctrine. The Church of England gives theology expression in commentaries on the creeds. The Nicene Creed as the formula of Christian unity.

BOOK III

CHRISTIAN WORSHIP

CHAPTER I

BAPTISM 399–437

Value of the two sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, as expressing the essence of the Christian faith. Exalted and positive tone in speaking of baptism in the early church. The religious experience of Cyprian. Changes which the rite of baptism has undergone. The repetition of, forbidden. The formula of baptism. Baptism in the name of Jesus only. Anonymous treatise on Rebaptism in the age of Cyprian, and combating his policy. The meaning of Confirmation. Baptism preceded by an ethical training in the Catechumenate. Transition from adult to infant baptism; an expression of the sanctity of life. The overcoming of infanticide. The doctrine of infant damnation. The Catechumenate preceding baptism in the early church gives way in the Middle Ages to discipline after baptism. The 'penitential books'; their method and value. "Whosesoever sins ye remit." The inward motive and the outward act. Substitution in punishment. The doctrine of endless punishment. Purgatory. The common treasury of merit. Indulgences. Defect in the Mediæval system of discipline. The unconscious aims of life. Martin Luther. The principle of the *opus operatum*. The system of discipline not retained in the Lutheran and Anglican churches. Its decline in the Reformed church. Ethical modes and standards. The Book of

PAGES

Common Prayer. The doctrine of Election and the Reformed church. The doctrine of Justification by Faith and the church in Germany. Private judgment. The duty toward man and the duty toward God. The freedom of the Christian man. Dangers which threaten freedom. The progress of the race and of the individual. The confession of St. Paul, "I have kept the faith."

CHAPTER II

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRINCIPLES WHICH AFFECTED THE CULTUS 438–465

The line of cleavage in worship. The worship of the monastery and the ritual of the altar. Fuller development of the sacrament of the altar in the Eastern church. The Latin doctrine of transubstantiation met with resistance in the West. Christian worship not an imitation of the heathen mysteries. The principles which underlay the nature-worships. The influence of Plato undermined the mythologies. His influence on the church. Gnosticism and Manichæanism. The reaction of heathen religion, and the revival of the nature-worships. Its influence traced in the ante-Nicene age. Tertullian. The Apologists on the lack of temples, altars, priesthood, and images in the early church. The contempt for Egyptian worship. The expiring heathenism. The place of Egypt in religious history. Greek religion. Neoplatonism. Its relation to Gnosticism. Its deterioration and failure to become a religion. The principle of Monophysitism. The doctrine of the Incarnation. Athanasius and Cyril of Alexandria. The Anthropomorphic Controversy. The condemnation of Origen. The sacramental theology. The final victory over heathenism. Contrast with the development of the Jewish church.

CHAPTER III

THE CHRISTIAN CULTUS 466–514

The weekly cycle. The Christian year. Coincidence of Easter with the season of spring in the natural year. Epiphany. Its parallelism with nature. Difference in the interpretation of, in the Eastern and Western churches. Christmas Day. Why it came so late. Its relation to Epiphany; to the Incarnation; to heathen contemporaneous festivals. The Christian drama of life. The consecration of matter. Tertullian on the water of baptism. The symbol and the thing signified. The physical sign as possessing a spiritual potency. The elements of bread and wine. The teaching of Gregory of Nyssa. The worship of saints, images, and relics. The two conceptions of the Incarnation. Meaning of the expression, "The Word was made flesh." The resurrection of the body. The Holy Spirit as the bond uniting the spiritual and the material. The deification of the flesh. The worship of the Virgin Mother.

PAGES

The reverence for relics. The power of the sign of the cross. The nature-philosophy. Love of nature in the Oriental church. Bearing upon the definition of the miracle. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Western church. Dionysius the Areopagite. His personality. Influenced by the Neoplatonic philosophy. Wherein he differs from it. The Heavenly Hierarchy. The principle of mediation. The ministry of angels. The Earthly Hierarchy. The number of the Christian mysteries. Significance of ritual acts. Use of the name 'Jesus' by Dionysius. His conception of the symbol and its necessity. But the enlightened soul gazes upon the reality. Treatise on the Divine Names. The nature of evil in the thought of Dionysius. The Greek and Latin anthropologies. Influence of Dionysius in Western Christendom.

CHAPTER IV

THE LORD'S SUPPER 515–565

Its relation to the Agape. References to the Agape in the Didache and in the Epistles of Ignatius. Justin Martyr's account of the administration of the Lord's Supper. Transference of the Eucharist from the evening to the morning, and the reasons for the change. The Lord's Supper in the writings of Clement of Alexandria. The final prohibition of the Agape. The Lord's Supper a protest against Docetism and an ultra-spiritualism which underrated the body and the material world. In what sense the word 'sacrifice' was connected with the Eucharist in the early church. The essence of sacrifice in the transfiguration of life in the presence of God. The Clementine liturgy. Tertullian on the power of simplicity in worship. Transition to an imposing ritual. The dramatization of the last supper of Christ with His disciples. The rubrical injunctions of the Clementine liturgy. The eucharistic prayer. The Great Entrance. The oblation of the consecrated elements. The worship of the elements before consecration. The principle of ceremonial worship as given by Gregory of Nyssa. The commemoration of nature in the Greek liturgies is absent from the Roman Mass. The invocation of the Holy Spirit, which in the Greek conception is essential to the transmutation of the elements, also wanting in the Roman Mass. Description of the ritual of the altar by Dionysius. Indebtedness of the Oriental type of worship to the influence of Dionysius. Analogy between the worship of heaven and earth. The comment of Symeon, Archbishop of Thessalonica, upon the meaning of the Greek rite. Distinctive features of the Roman Mass. Its penitential character. It reflects the influences of the age when it was taking form. The Greek liturgies contain a deeper eucharistic element. God is represented as the actor and agency in the Greek ritual, while in the Latin the agency of the priest is more prominent. The tendency of the Greek liturgy toward rhetorical fulness as compared

PAGES

with the terseness and brevity of the Latin. Comparison of the coronation rites in the two churches. The Latin *Sacramentum* and the Greek *Musterion* convey differing ideas which are still perpetuated. The *doctrine of intention.* Explanation of its origin. The decision of the Roman church in regard to *intention* at the Council of Trent. The value of the ancient liturgies as bearing witness to the common Christian experience. Decline of creative ritual activity after the fifteenth century. Deficiency of Greek ritual. Its hints of higher possibilities have since been realized. Wordsworth and Dionysius. The revelations of science and of modern art. The rejection of transubstantiation by the Protestant churches as final. The true sacrifice must include the worship of God with the mind as well as with the heart.

INDEX 567–577

ERRATA.

Page 9, line 3 in first footnote, *for* "Becon's Work," *read* "Becon, *Works.*"

„ 57, line 3 in footnote, *for* "des," *read* "der."

„ 60, line 11, *for* "organizations," *read* "organization."

„ 73, line 14, *for* "deacons," *read* "teachers."

„ 95, first footnote, *omit* "Gieseler, *Ec. His.*, i., p. 150," and *insert* "Harnack, *D. G.*, vol. i., p. 405."

„ 105, line 8 from foot, *for* second "des," *read* "der."

„ 116, from line 4 of text to line 8 on p. 117, *substitute* the following:—

And this, Cyprian adds, was done in the case of "our colleague, Sabinus; so that by the suffrage of the whole brotherhood, and by *sentence* of the bishops assembled in their presence, the episcopate was conferred upon him and hands were imposed on him." The object of Cyprian is to guard the entrance to the ministry or to justify the ejection of the unworthy. The sin of apostasy is prominent in his mind, which afterwards became the allegation of the Donatists in justification of their departure from the Catholic church. He enforces his exhortation by analogies of Jewish priesthood, by references also to the ordinations of Matthias and the Seven. But the tone and emphasis of his exhortation shows a divergence from the Apostolic attitude. The stress is upon human qualifications; the ethical purpose is unmistakable, but there is no appeal for the recognition of an inward and divine call,—"Show which of these two *Thou* hast chosen" (Acts i. 24), or the direct qualification of the Spirit,—"Look ye out among you seven men . . ., *full of the Holy Ghost*" (Acts vi. 3). Hence the tendency to modify the original significance of the laying on of hands, as the human recognition of an antecedent divine call and qualification (Acts xiii. 2).

Page 186, footnote 4, *omit* ", for a full discussion of the Petrine claim," and *insert* "; Langen, *Geschichte d. Römischen Kirche.*"

„ 202, *insert* "I" underneath heading of chapter.

„ 268, line 13 from foot, *insert* a comma after "principles."

„ 304, line 9 from foot, *omit* "heathen," and *insert* "the."

THE institutions of Christianity may be classed under three heads: the Organization of the Church, its Creeds, and its Cultus or Worship. By the word 'institution' is to be understood the outward form or embodiment, which the spirit of Christianity assumes, corresponding to some inward mode of apprehending the Christian faith. Hence there is a deep significance in the phases of the ecclesiastical organization, as well as in the articles of the creed, or the divers aspects of the cultus. To detect fluctuations in the inward apprehension of the divine reality, beneath the changes of external form, should be the object of any inquiry into Christian institutions.

There have been two epochs in the history of the Christian church which have stamped themselves upon its external features. In the second century, the process began of translating Christianity into terms which should be intelligible in the Roman Empire. The result of this process is known as Catholicism, whether Greek or Roman. It included the remoulding of the ecclesiastical organization, under the influence of the Roman genius for administration and government and law. The Roman spirit dictated the form of the church, and handed it over to the East as its contribution to the triumph of Christianity within the bounds of the Empire. But Rome did nothing for theology. It was Greece which contributed the language and the forms of thought into which should be rendered the spirit and the meaning of the new religion. The Greek interpretation of Christianity as a principle of

life or a formula of thought took shape in the Nicene Creed, which was received by Rome, and became the watchword of the Catholic faith. And again, the cultus of the church was influenced in its external form by the spirit of old religion, especially the ancient Mysteries, in which the deep moral earnestness of a dying world was seeking expression when Christianity appeared. These were alike a preparation for the fulness of time: the Roman genius for government and administration, Greek philosophy, and the ancient Mysteries of Oriental origin. They constituted as it were the language which Christianity must adopt, if it was to make the conquest of the Empire for Christ.

The Roman Empire constituted the world into which Christianity was born, wherein also it sought and found its opportunity. There were Christian missions in countries outside the Empire, in Arabia, in Persia, and it is said in India, but they left no permanent impression. The Christian faith did not overcome Arabian idolatry, or Persian dualism, and as to India it left no traces there of its presence. This is remarkable, because at a later time Islam entered these countries and either made them its own or, as in India, established itself by the side of the dominant faith. But of all these countries it may be said that they had no immediate future; they were not, then at least, called to any high function in the service of humanity. The open door which admitted to world-wide opportunities was the Roman Empire. Through that door the Christian church entered in and took possession.

Although Christianity took form as Catholicism in such a manner as to be intelligible and impressive to the ancient world within the bounds of the Empire, yet beneath the outward garb of Catholicity or its partial form, there was always working the original spirit of Christ's religion. The organization of the Catholic church was forced to adapt itself to Monasticism, in which was perpetuated, in obscure and even obnoxious ways, the purer purpose of the earlier church as it may be read in the teachings of Christ and the writings of Apostles and

Apostolic men, — the direct relation of the individual soul with God. Beneath the terminology of theological discussions may always be detected the simple issue of the relation of the Son of God to the Eternal Father. Beneath the ritual and the rich complexity of the cultus there is preserved a trace of the original institution of the Lord's supper, when Christ broke the bread and administered the cup, as effectual symbols of the food by which God nourishes His children.

In the rise of Protestantism, which constitutes the second great epoch in the history of the church, the effort was made to separate the purely Christian motives from those forms of Catholicism, which had become unintelligible and unprofitable to the new age. The decline of the mediæval Catholic church was contemporaneous with the decline and final disappearance of the Holy Roman Empire as a factor in human history. Wherever the influence of the Reformation was felt, there was a change in the organization of the church in order to the better reflection and expression of the human spirit, set free from an arbitrary external authority. There was as deep an instinct at work in the reorganization of the Protestant churches as there had been in the second and third centuries, when Catholicism arose. In the place of administration as the means of highest grace was substituted the preaching of the word. The Catholic creeds were retained, but their interpretation was changed to bring them into closer harmony with the teaching of Christ and with the higher and more spiritual consciousness of the new era. The Catholic ritual and cultus was either abandoned or simplified in varying degrees, but so as to bring into greater clearness its original germ, the celebration of the Lord's supper. In place of the worship of the human, was restored the worship of God in spirit and in truth.

But beneath all these changes there was still retained by the Protestant churches whatever was true or vital in Catholicism, so that there was no break in the higher reality of a continuous life in the Christian ages. The Protestants claimed, or were entitled to claim, had they

cared to do so, the designation of Catholic, since they clung to the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, and in retaining the Catholic canon of Scripture preserved their unbroken succession from the Apostles. If this consciousness of the continuous life of the church was for a while weakened or obscured, it was in order to a deeper hold upon the truth which Catholicism had neglected. It is a characteristic of the present age that it finds its surest apology for the Christian faith, not only in the appeal which that faith still makes to the soul, but also in the fact that God has never left Himself without a witness in the past, that there has been an unbroken succession of the sons of God in every generation, who have borne witness to the power of His Word, handing on to those who follow the torch of light and truth amid the surrounding darkness, until humanity should step forth into the fuller day.

CHRISTIAN INSTITUTIONS

BOOK I

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCH

CHAPTER I

HISTORICAL SURVEY

THE form which the government of the church assumes in any given age is not an accident, but must be regarded as an outward expression of a spirit working from within — the embodiment of some intelligible purpose. Just as a deep significance attaches to the variations of Christian doctrine, so also there is a meaning in the changes which have taken place in ecclesiastical organization. They do not come by chance or as a result of negligence or indifference, nor are they imposed by usurpation upon an unwilling people. Differing forms of church government become as it were a language, in which may be read the peculiar genius of a nation, or the motives which are supreme at any moment in history, or the diverse interpretations of the Christian spirit, or the varied results which the churches desire to accomplish. In the history of ecclesiastical organizations may be discerned the successive phases of civilization, no less than the epochs of growth through which the church as a whole has passed, in accordance with a law of progress which it is impossible to evade.

The distinctive form of the ministry in the Apostolic age slowly gave way in the second century to a type of organization generated by the necessities of the age which called for a centralized administration, as the best method in any community for the attainment of inward harmony.

A bishop or pastor was made supreme in the local church, without whose sanction no ecclesiastical functions should be performed. But this type of government was in process of change from the moment of its birth. Beneath the bishop or pastor grew up the order of the presbyters, who gradually assumed the more important functions of the bishop, while the bishop became more closely identified with the administration of ecclesiastical affairs. But above the bishops there rose the metropolitans, who in their turn were subjected in the Eastern churches to the authority of the patriarch, the impersonation of the cause of national unity. But the spirit of nationality was not operative in the Western church at the time when it was the most potent factor in Oriental Christendom. In the West, therefore, in place of national unity as the controlling motive, there was substituted the unity of ecclesiastical empire, where the Bishop of Rome developed slowly into the Roman papacy. When the Reformation came, in the sixteenth century, the new-born spirit of nationality was the expanding force which broke down the papal supremacy, leaving the nations free to readjust the organization of the churches in the different states of Europe in accordance with a truer apprehension of the nature of Christ's religion, or the best method of promoting its growth.

I

The conflicts between the churches from the time of the Reformation raised the question of the origin of the Christian ministry. When Papacy, Presbytery, and Episcopacy were struggling against each other, as if in mortal combat, the adherents of each of these divergent ecclesiastical polities sought for its sanction the prestige of Apostolic usage or authority. The heritage of that age of rivalry and antagonism has descended to our own day, creating presumptions and prejudices from which it is difficult to escape, which may still, consciously or unconsciously, condition the methods and the results of any inquiry into the origin of the ministry. It was in England that the controversy was

waged most bitterly between Puritans and Anglicans, as to whether presbytery or episcopacy could claim the sanction of divine right. Into the merits of this controversy it is not possible to enter here, but a brief summary may be given of the argument on either side. In order, however, to appreciate the relative situation of the combatants, it will be necessary to go back for a moment to the early church, where the first hints are to be detected of a process which eventually ripened into the open revolt of the later age.

It was St. Jerome († 420) who first questioned the divine right of that form of church government known as episcopacy. Tertullian, indeed, some two centuries earlier, had asserted that the distinction between presbyters and bishops was a matter of human arrangement; but Tertullian's defection from the Catholic church weakened the force of his later opinions. When Jerome lived, episcopacy in some form had been long established, in accordance with which those ministers who preached and ministered the sacraments, and were known as presbyters, were under the authority of another class of ministers known as bishops. It was Jerome's contention that bishops and presbyters were of equal authority in the beginning of Christ's religion, that the terms 'presbyter' and 'bishop' were synonymous expressions in the New Testament, and that the placing of the bishop above the presbyter was an ecclesiastical arrangement which was made in consequence of schisms and other disorders in the churches.

While the statement of Jerome, or his challenge, as it has been sometimes regarded, awoke no controversy in the church, yet it is significant to note that his criticism attracted attention and was not forgotten. In the Middle Ages, the memory of it was perpetuated in the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, in which was inserted his remark about the original equality of bishops and presbyters.[1] It could

[1] Cf. *Decreti*, *Pars* I., *Distinct.* 95, c. 5. The Canon is headed "Presbyter idem est qui et episcopus ac sola consuetudine presbyteris episcopi presunt"; and the evidence in support of this proposition is

not, then, have wholly surprised the learned world in the age before the Reformation when Marsilius of Padua, in his *Defensor Pacis*, reaffirmed the statement of Jerome that in the New Testament bishop and presbyter are convertible designations of the same office. Marsilius, in advocating the reduction of ecclesiastical power, felt that he stood on unimpeachable ground, when he affirmed that existing ecclesiastical arrangements have no sanction in Scripture.[1] To the testimony of Jerome, Wycliffe also appealed in his *Trialogus*, where he maintained that the office of presbyter carried the highest functions of the Christian ministry, as the preaching of the Word and the cure of souls.[2]

In the revolutions of the sixteenth century, ecclesiastical episcopacy was abolished by the Lutheran church in Germany and Denmark, as also by the Reformed church of Calvin, on the ground that it had no warrant in Scripture, seeing that bishop and presbyter were different terms standing for the same office. Even in the Church of England, where the episcopate was retained, the same view found expression in the utterances of the bishops and others when the question was propounded, "whether bishops or priests were first, and if the priests were first, then the

drawn from Jerome: "Item Jeronimus supra epistolam ad Titum, olim idem presbyter, qui et episcopus, et antequam diaboli instinctu studia in religione fierant, et diceretur in populis: Ego sum Pauli, ego sum Apollo, ego sum Caphae, communi presbyterorum consilio ecclesiae gubernabantur. Postquam autem unusquisque eos, quos baptizauerat suos esse putabit, non Christi, in toto orbe decretum est, ut unus de presbyteris superponesetur et scismatum semina tollerentur. Et paulo post: § 1. Sicut ergo presbyteri sciunt, se ex ecclesiae consuetudine ei, qui sibi prepositus fuerit, esse subjectos, ita episcopi nouerint se magis consuetudine quam dispensationis dominicae veritate presbyteris esse maiores, et in communi debere ecclesiam regere."

[1] "Ecce quod in ecclesia unius municipii plures allocutus est apostolus tanquam episcopus, quod non fuit nisi propter sacerdotum pluralitatem, qui omnes episcopi dicebantur, propter hoc, quod superintendentes esse debebant populo." Fol. 239. Marsilius is commenting on Paul's farewell address at Miletus. Cf. Neander, *Chris. His.*, Vol. IX., p. 44. Bohn ed.

[2] "Unum audacter assero, quod in primitiva ecclesia ut tempore Pauli suffecerunt duo ordines clericorum, scilicet sacerdos atque diaconus. Secundo dico, quod in tempore apostoli fuit idem presbyter atque episcopus; patet 1 Tim. iii. et ad Titum i." (*Trialogus*, IV. 15, p. 296).

priests made the bishop?" The answers to this question reveal a wide difference of opinion among the bishops and leading divines who were consulted; some maintaining that the Apostles, who were depositaries of power bequeathed to them by Christ, had in turn delegated their powers to their successors; who were bishops, and that priests had never been made except by bishops. Others, among whom were the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, thought that bishops may have originally been made by presbyters or priests, or that it was a matter of slight consequence, if it had been so. It is interesting to note in these replies the appeal to Jerome's statement, as if it carried in it the weight of axiom, "as Jerome saith in an epistle to Evagrius."[1] When the Puritans, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, questioned the authority of the bishops, it was on the ground that this ancient office found no support in Scripture. Instead of the threefold order of bishops, priests, and deacons retained in the Church of England, the Puritans held that the New Testament recognized four classes or kinds of ministers, — doctors or teachers, pastors, elders, and deacons.[2] Neither Whitgift, the Archbishop of Canterbury, nor Hooker, who both replied to the Puritans, defended Episcopacy on the ground that it was expressly set forth in the New Testament as the only and divine order of church government. Whitgift thought the church had been left free in this respect, to adapt its government to the circumstances of the age or people in which its lot was cast. Hooker held that order was divine, but that

[1] Cf. Burnet, *History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, Vol. IV., where the original documents are given. See also *The Catechism*, in Becon's Work, Parker Soc. ed., p. 319: "*Father.* What difference is there between a bishop and a spiritual minister? *Son.* None at all: their office is one, their authority and power is one. And therefore St. Paul calleth the spiritual ministers sometime bishops, sometime elders, sometime pastors, sometime teachers, etc." Becon was chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer and Prebendary of Canterbury, and wrote in the reign of King Edward VI. There is ground for thinking that Cranmer may have changed his opinion on this question.

[2] Cf. Contemp. Books of Discipline in Appendix to Briggs, C. A., *American Presbyterianism.*

no fixed order was prescribed by Scripture. He parried the criticism on the episcopate, made in the name of Jerome, by the remark that "things are always ancienter than their names," and so there may have been bishops in reality, while yet the names of bishops and presbyters were interchangeable. The truth of this remark has been to a certain extent borne out by later research.

It was during this phase of the controversy that the preface to the ordinal had been set forth by the Anglican church, in which it is declared that "It is evident to all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church, — Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." The caution and moderation of this position is apparent when we take into view the confusion caused by Jerome's statement. It is not affirmed that Holy Scripture by itself is sufficient to demonstrate the existence of the episcopate, but that Scripture does so when supplemented by ancient authors. Nor is it declared that the episcopate existed in the age of the Apostles, but "from their time," which may be interpreted as during their time or immediately afterwards. Had the conviction prevailed that the Apostles ordered the episcopate, as the permanent divine form of the church's government, there would not have been this moderation or even ambiguity of language. We may take Lord Bacon as representing a widespread and intelligent sentiment in the Church of England, in the view which he put forth that Episcopacy is not opposed to Scripture, but that the Scripture does not prescribe any fixed, unalterable form of ecclesiastical polity.

But a great change of attitude on this question was coming over the Church of England, which began to appear in the later years of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. It was signalled by the sermon of Bishop Bancroft at St. Paul's Cross in 1588, in which he amazed the Puritans by boldly defending Episcopacy on the ground of its divine institution. Jerome's statement no longer embarrassed him, for did not Jerome also add, that the bishop had

been placed above the presbyter for the purpose of preventing that confusion which the Puritans were now again creating by refusing to listen to the bishops? From this time it was sought to determine the question of the origin of the ministry by the closer study of the New Testament, though among Anglican writers the testimony of the Fathers was not neglected. In the work of Bishop Hall, *Episcopacy by Divine Right Asserted*, written in 1640, and it is said at the suggestion of Archbishop Laud, the New Testament argument for Episcopacy is based on the Pastoral Letters to Timothy and Titus, who are regarded as diocesan bishops possessing the Apostolic sanction, and therefore of divine origin. What St. Paul had done for the churches of Ephesus and Crete, the other Apostles must also have done for the churches which they planted. That they must have done so is further inferred from the fact of the universal prevalence of the episcopate in the age following the Apostles. It would be absurd to suppose that this was a new form of church government set up after the death of the Apostles by the ancient fathers. And further it is claimed for this position, that bishops were spoken of by these fathers, such as Irenæus and Tertullian, as successors of the Apostles, and that this seems to have been the universal belief. By this mode of argument Hall sought to overcome the embarrassment caused by Jerome's statement, that in the beginning of Christ's religion the terms bishop and presbyter were but different names for one and the same office. As Jerome had not specified at what time or by what authority the bishop was distinguished from and elevated above the presbyter, it was open to affirm that the change had been made with the authority or divine sanction of the Apostles themselves.[1]

[1] Bishop Hall quoted Clement of Rome, who lived at the close of the Apostolic age, as asserting distinctly that the Apostles foresaw that there would be strife about the offices of the church, and had therefore themselves appointed men to govern the church, who should take their places when they were departed. He also alluded to Ignatius, who had told the church to do nothing without the bishops and to be subject to their authority as to the voice of God.

Bishop Hall's book on Episcopacy by Divine Right was answered by Smectymnuus, a joint work of several Puritan writers. Their position, like that of Hall, is interesting for its historical value, as presenting the method which was to be substantially followed in the controversy down to the present day. In the reply to Bishop Hall, the Puritans urged the statement of Jerome, which no one who carefully read the New Testament could deny, that originally bishops and presbyters were but one office. In Timothy and Titus they saw only the temporary office of an evangelist, moving from place to place, whose business it was to plant or organize churches according to the presbyterial scheme, in which presbyters (or bishops) should have the supreme authority. Neither Timothy nor Titus were called 'bishops,' nor were they placed permanently at Ephesus or Crete, nor were they ordered while they remained there to appoint bishops who should be superior to presbyters, but rather to appoint presbyters, as they had also received their own office, by the laying on of hands of the presbytery. From their study of ancient history they saw also that those who were called bishops in the second century were not the diocesan bishops of a later time, but held an office corresponding more nearly with that of the pastor in charge of a local church.

Many of the most prominent men of the seventeenth century took part in the controversy, among others John Milton, whose study of Catholic antiquity for the purpose of solving the problem of prelacy gave him a sense of its worthlessness as far as any honest or valuable testimony was concerned. Ussher and Stillingfleet, Pearson, Hammond, and Jeremy Taylor, and Richard Baxter continued the discussion, which led to no agreement in opinion. There was no clear picture of the actual situation in the early church before the minds of the combatants, nor was there sufficient knowledge of that distant age to afford material for such a picture. The facts of history were mingled with assumptions and *a priori* interpretations. Jeremy Taylor suggested a departure from the usual form of the argument, when he maintained that the Apostles

were originally the bishops but did not take that name, and that they appointed presbyters (or bishops) and deacons, thus making up the threefold order. When the Apostles departed, those whom they had appointed to succeed in the office of oversight gradually came to be known as bishops, so that the names 'bishop' and 'presbyter,' which were at first interchangeable, came to be distinguished from each other. But the difficulty raised by Jerome's statement was not overcome in the seventeenth century. It was open to Anglicans to infer that bishops were meant where presbyters were mentioned; or to Puritans, to maintain that presbyters were to be understood where bishops were mentioned. But what is most noteworthy in the long dissension is the reversal of attitudes by the two parties. It was Puritans, and not Anglicans, who in the sixteenth century maintained that the New Testament gave divine sanction to a certain fixed ecclesiastical order. But in the following century the Anglicans moved on to the Puritan ground, while the Puritans tended toward the attitude of Whitgift and Hooker, that no form of church government is authoritatively prescribed by Scripture, that the form is a matter of indifference provided that a stable order be maintained. But it was a loss to the Puritans when they yielded their contention that the ministry of their churches was by divine right, or, in other words, possessed the explicit sanction of the New Testament.

If the Anglicans never quite escaped the embarrassment caused by Jerome's statement, their opponents also encountered an equal difficulty when the appeal was taken to antiquity and ancient authors. In the earlier stages of the argument the writings of Ignatius had received but little notice. So far as his Epistles were known, it was in the Long Greek Recension, concerning which Calvin had reflected the sober Protestant sentiment, when he remarked that "nothing can be more nauseating than the absurdities which have been published under the name of Ignatius." But in 1644, Archbishop Ussher published his edition of the Shorter Greek Recension, then recently dis-

covered in a Latin version, which consisted of seven letters only, and these free from the anachronisms and absurdities of the longer recension. The genuineness of this shorter recension was ably defended by Bishop Pearson. In these writings, which if genuine belonged to the early years of the second century (A.D. 110–117), there was no longer any interchangeable use of the names 'bishop' and 'presbyter'; but three orders were sharply distinguished, — bishops, presbyters, and deacons. Not only so, but the authority of the bishop was magnified to an extent far beyond what Anglican prelates had essayed to go in their encounters with the Puritans. It was now easy, on the one hand, to take the leap from the Ignatian Epistles to the heart of the Apostolic age; for it seemed impossible that a revolution in church government could have been accomplished so soon, between the lifetime of the Apostles and the appearance of Ignatius. When the appeal was thus taken to the fathers of the early church, the only way open on the Puritan side was to deny the genuineness of the Ignatian Epistles, even in their more reputable form. Such was the attitude of Daillé, a once famous continental scholar, who was also the author of a treatise on the *Right Use of the Fathers in the Decision of Controversies.* The appeal to the ancient church had been made necessary by the rise of the Independents, who alike with the Presbyterians and the Anglicans were contending that Scripture furnished a clear and authoritative account of the Christian ministry. But the later Independents found but two classes in the ministry, — pastors (who were called indifferently bishops or elders or teachers) and deacons. The rise of the Society of Friends or Quakers added still further to the confusion, for in the New Testament they found no trace of an official ministry, while their attention was chiefly riveted on an order of the prophets the existence of which was overlooked by the other churches.

But the interest in the controversy was dying out in the closing years of the seventeenth century, not to be revived again until the study of Church History should be taken

up in more thorough and scientific fashion in our own age. Two important works, however, appeared, as the controversy waned, which represent the learning and scholarship of the time: Lord King's *Enquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, Unity, and Worship of the Primitive Church*, published in 1691, — a work which has an historical interest, since its authority was accepted by John Wesley when he appointed bishops for the Methodist church in America; and Bingham's *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, — a work of great learning and patience, of which the first volume appeared in 1708.

II

Under the impulse given to the study of Church History in the opening years of the nineteenth century, a change has been wrought in the method of historical inquiry which has altered the mode of approach to what are known as Christian Antiquities. The doctrine that a law of development underlies all institutions, whether divine or human, has been an inspiration to scholars who have been engaged in the study of the early Christian church. In the first enthusiasm created by the application of this principle, theories were set forth regarding the origin of the church and the ministry, which have since been abandoned. A certain dogmatic tone has characterized the work of the Tübingen School, for example, as though final conclusions had been reached. The conviction that the organization of the church is the result of growth, conditioned by human instincts, by the needs of the age, or by the peculiarities of different countries, seemed at first a method as fruitful as it was easy, for the solution of the problems of early Christian history. But the wisdom acquired by many failures has revealed a more complex and complicated situation, which makes it no easy task to unravel the threads of life in the ancient world. It has therefore been found necessary for the moment to cease from large generalizations as to how

results are accomplished, and to confine inquiry to gaining an exact and thorough knowledge of all accessible materials, as the basis for some larger conclusion which has not yet been reached. In this modesty of attitude is the promise of greater things, even though it may take a lifetime to accomplish some slight contribution to the picture which is yet to be drawn.

Among those who led in the departure from the older methods of inquiry, were Rothe and Baur, by both of whom the episcopate was regarded as holding a vital relationship to the rise of the Catholic church. Rothe was so impressed with its almost universal adoption from an early date, as well as by its prominence and the purpose it had served, that it seemed to him as if such an institution could only be accounted for on the ground of an Apostolic origin, even though it were not the form which the government of the church had assumed in the Apostolic age. He explained its rise and predominance by a theory which has found no other advocate, that the Apostles met in council about the year 70, and organized the church on an episcopal basis.[1] Baur regarded the episcopate as the agency by which the Catholic church realized its unity, when threatened by Gnostic philosophers or by the Montanist movement, which would have reduced the church to the dimensions of a narrow sect. The episcopate, in his view, was not of Apostolic institution, but had developed out of the presbyterate in the earlier part of the second century. Each congregation of believers had been originally under the charge of a presbyter; but as the congregations multiplied in a town or city, one of these presbyters came to represent the rest, and to stand at their head. This headship, which was at first of a representative character, tended inevitably to assume a monarchical character, until the power to administer sac-

[1] Rothe, *Die Anfänge der christlichen Kirche und ihrer Verfassung*, 1837, pp. 354–392. Rothe's explanation was rejected by Baur, *Ueber den Ursprung des Episcopates in der christl. Kirche*, 1838, pp. 39 ff. Ritschl has given a careful examination of Rothe's theory in his *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*, 2d ed., 1857, pp. 399 ff., and shown that it is untenable.

raments and ordination, which from the first had inhered in the presbyterate, was allowed to them only conditionally on the permission of the bishop, until at last the right to ordain was at the council of Ancyra (A.D. 314) definitely and finally withdrawn. It was Baur's misfortune that he studied the subject of Christian origins under the influence of a preconceived theory as to the rise of the Catholic church; and although his keen insight and learning have rendered great service to later students, his conclusions regarding the early organization of the church, and especially of the episcopate, have not been sustained by the investigation which his labors have stimulated.

An impartial investigation of the origin of the Catholic church was undertaken by Ritschl, who recognized a certain kind of episcopate in the church at Jerusalem in the Apostolic age, which was not, however, perpetuated. James, the Lord's brother, who was not one of the Twelve, assumed the headship of the church at Jerusalem, as Ritschl suggested, in consequence of his blood relationship to Christ, — a theory which found confirmation in the circumstance reported by Eusebius, that he was followed in his office by Simeon, who was a cousin-german of our Lord. This type of ecclesiastical organization was compared with that adopted by Islam after the death of Mohammed. An attempt at its reproduction in the Catholic church may be seen in the pseudo-Clementine writings, where Clement took the headship of the church, with Rome as its centre, after Jerusalem lost its importance as a city. According to Ritschl the Catholic type of episcopate had its rise among the communities of Asia Minor, where at first it had a local character, and from thence spread into Greece and Rome, and finally into Egypt.

Renan, in his treatment of the origin of Christianity, offered no definite theory of his own as to the rise and growth of the Christian ministry; but wherever he touches the subject does so under the influence of a motive which had not hitherto been operative, — that the government of the church not only developed various modifications in response to the changing situations of the hour, passing

from a pure democracy to a presbyterial form, and from this changing to episcopacy, but that it was also influenced by the models of secular government, that ecclesiastical history can no longer be separated from secular history, but that both are in organic relationship and form one living whole.[1] What Renan followed in a general way as the true method for studying ecclesiastical beginnings, Dr. Hatch has pursued in a more definite way and with more exact results, finding a close analogy between the form assumed by the various societies among the Greeks within the Roman Empire and the organization of the early Christian communities. It was the special contribution of Dr. Hatch to this long inquiry that he pointed out the character of the episcopate as essentially an administrative office, possessing that most important function in every organization, the proper disposition of its funds, in which respect they resemble the officers of contemporary Greek societies.[2]

Among those who have contributed to the study of ecclesiastical origins, the name of the late Bishop Lightfoot must always be held in deep respect. By his vindication of the genuineness of the Ignatian Epistles he has established at least one fixed point in the development of the ministry, putting an end to the hopeless confusion caused by the Tübingen School, with its arbitrary assignments of early Christian literature.[3] Not only did Bishop Lightfoot render this important service, but in his Essay on the Christian Ministry, he traced the gradual spread of the Ignatian type of the episcopate, until by the middle of the third century Episcopacy in some form had become the uniform mode of government of the Catholic church. He also called attention to the twofold use of the term

[1] *Histoire des Origines du Christianisme*, Vol. V.; *Les Évangiles*, c. XV., Vol. VI.; *L'Église Chrétienne*, c. 6; *Progrès de l'Épiscopat.*

[2] *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches, being the Bampton Lectures for 1880.* Dr. Hatch's work was translated into German by Dr. Harnack and supplemented with valuable discussions on the origin of the presbyterate and the episcopate.

[3] For a sketch of the Ignatian Controversy, cf. Schaff, *Ch. His.*, II., pp. 263 ff.; also Renan, in introduction to *Les Évangiles.*

'Apostle' in the ancient church: its narrower sense, in which it was finally restricted to the Twelve, being for the most part later than the larger use in which the title was applied to the great number of those who went forth everywhere to preach the Word and lay the foundations of Christian communities. The Apostolate, as he has shown, was originally an order in the church, whose distinctive functions did not descend to the later ministry.

The main thesis in Bishop Lightfoot's essay was the original identity of the names 'bishop' and 'presbyter,' from which he drew the conclusion that "the episcopate was not formed out of the Apostolic order by localization, but out of the presbyterial by elevation; and the title, which originally was common to all, came at length to be appropriated to the chief among them."[1] Bishop Lightfoot also defined the episcopate as a centralization of authority in place of the somewhat looser presbyterial government which preceded it; and he held that the sanction for the change must, in the nature of the case, have come from St. John, who was residing in Asia Minor at the time when the change must have occurred.

A generation has now passed since the Essay on the Christian Ministry was written, within the last decade of which there has been a renewed discussion of the subject, and two important departures have been taken from Bishop Lightfoot's attitude. In the first place, the famous dictum of St. Jerome, which has held its own for so many centuries, that bishop and presbyter were originally differing titles for the same office, has at last been disputed on critical grounds. Dr. Hatch, who first called attention to the grounds for questioning this position, has been followed by Dr. Harnack, who has offered convincing reasons for holding that the office of bishop was from the beginning distinct from that of the presbyter, and that, however great may have been the later increase of the bishop's prerogatives or the modification of his functions, he still

[1] Cf. *Essay on the Christian Ministry* in *Comm. on Philippians*, p. 196, ed. 1891; also note on the name and office of an apostle in *Comm. on Galatians*, pp. 314 ff.

retained the same essential quality which marked his first appearance, and which also from the first differentiated him from the presbyter. On this assumption, that we must take names and titles as we find them in the New Testament or in ancient writers, and that no theory about the origin of the ministry can be sustained which requires the explaining away of official designations by making them equivalent to other terms, or which supplements the organization as described by any writer with other offices in order to harmonize it with some hypothesis of what must have been, — on this simple and natural assumption the latest inquiries into the origin of the Christian ministry have been based.

And, in the second place, the discovery of the Didache, or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, which is generally assigned to the close of the first century, has at last furnished the clew to the true significance of allusions in the New Testament to the ministry, which have hitherto been strangely neglected. It reveals the ministry of the Apostolic age as it was on the point of vanishing from the church, and also the connection between that ministry and the age of Ignatius. Or, in the words of Dr. Harnack, "What the Didache has done for us is to supply a missing link in the history of the sub-Apostolic age."[1]

[1] Cf. Harnack in *Expositor*, New Series, Vol. V., 1887; also *Die Lehre der Zwölf Apostel* in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, von Gebhardt und Harnack, Bd. ii., Heft 1, 2; 1884. Other articles in the *Expositor*, discussing theories of the origin of the ministry by Sanday, Rendel Harris, Gore, and others, are given in Vols. V., VI., VII. See also an elaborate study by Réville, *Les Origines de l'Épiscopat; Étude sur la formation du Gouvernement Ecclésiastique au Sein de l'Église Chrétienne dans l'Empire Romain* (Première Partie), 1894.

CHAPTER II

APOSTLES, PROPHETS, TEACHERS

In any attempt to reproduce the picture of the ministry in the Apostolic age, or in the age which immediately succeeded, it is important to classify the literature which bears upon the subject according to the time when it was written. The difficulty of ascertaining the exact date of many of the New Testament writings constitutes an obstacle in the way of positive statement which makes impossible at present a complete and accurate account of the development of the Christian ministry. In the following sketch, no effort has been made to determine these questions of New Testament criticism. But in a general way the literature may be thus classified.

First in the order of time come the writings of St. Paul, which are the earliest Christian documents, older than the Gospels in their present form, and prior also to the Acts of the Apostles, which was written after the death of St. Paul. But the earlier part of the Acts contains an account of the genesis of the church which must be associated with the earlier Pauline Epistles. In this class of the literature is included the Epistles to the Corinthians, Galatians, Thessalonians, Romans, and Philippians, all of which contain references to the organization of the church.

In the second class come those documents which are admitted to be somewhat later in origin than those above mentioned, and about which doubts have been raised, not only as to their time, but as to whether they were written by the writers whose names they carry or to whom they have been ascribed by tradition. Without going into the question of date or authorship, it may be asserted of them all that they fall at least so late as the second generation

in the Apostolic age. These writings include the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of St. James, and 1 Peter, Ephesians and Hebrews, the Second and Third Epistles of St. John, the Book of Revelation, and, most important of all for the light they shed, the Pastoral Epistles to Timothy and Titus. The authorship and time of the Pastoral Epistles form one of the most difficult subjects in Biblical criticism, about which opinion is still greatly divided. They have been placed in the latter part of the second century; by some they are assigned to the close of the first century; others, still, have no hesitation in ascribing them to St. Paul.[1] If they were written by St. Paul, their time may be as late as the year 67 A.D. It is possible, also, as many are inclined to hold, that these Pastoral Epistles include genuine fragments by the great Apostle himself, sufficient to justify their connection with his name.

The third class of documents consists of three important treatises, which belong to the close of the Apostolic age, or the early years of the second century, — the Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, the Didache, or so-called Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, and the Epistles of Ignatius, to which may be added the Shepherd of Hermas, about whose date there is uncertainty. It may be later than the Ignatian Epistles.

I

The authoritative description of the ministry in the Apostolic age has been given to us by St. Paul: "*And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers; after that miracles, then gifts of*

[1] M. Réville, in his *Origines de l'Épiscopat*, places them toward the close of the first century, and regards the picture of the ministry which they present as the transition to the Ignatian Epistles. For the proposed reconstruction of dates in the life of Paul, cf. Holtzmann, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, § 16 (1895). The dates given in the text follow the hitherto accepted chronology but for convenience only, and where no important issue is concerned.

healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues."[1] The value of St. Paul's testimony lies in this, that he was contemporaneous with that which he described; he was writing to a church which he himself had planted and nourished; and we know the time when he wrote; it was about the year 57 A.D. when his Epistle was sent to the church at Corinth.

Upon this passage it may be remarked that St. Paul claims for this ministry of the Apostolic church a divine right or appointment, — it is God who has set these ministers in the church. Again, there is a distinct gradation, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers. These three offices or functions constitute the higher class of the ministry and have a certain spiritual kinship; the apostle preaches, the prophets speak by the gift of inspiration, the teacher explains the truth with the aid of human learning. In the lower grade of offices, or what may be called the administrative functions, two are mentioned in a general way, without technical designation, which have evidently the character of germs for the later development of the ministry, — they are helps and governments. But there is no mention of the familiar titles of a later day, — bishops, presbyters, or deacons.

There is another list of ecclesiastical offices given by St. Paul a few years later, in his Epistle to the Romans (A.D. 59): "Having gifts differing according to the grace that was given to us, whether prophecy (*προφητείαν*), let us prophesy according to the proportion of our faith; or ministry (*διακονίαν*), let us give ourselves to our ministry; or he that teacheth (*διδάσκων*), to his teaching; or he that exhorteth (*παρακαλῶν*), to his exhorting; he that giveth (*μεταδιδοὺς*), let him do it with liberality; he that ruleth (*προϊστάμενος*), with diligence; he that showeth mercy (*ἐλεῶν*), with cheerfulness" (Rom. xii. 6). Here again there is no mention of presbyters or bishops or deacons, though one may see an allusion to presbyters, in those

[1] I. Cor. xii. 28: *καὶ οὓς μὲν ἔθετο ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρῶτον ἀποστόλους, δεύτερον προφήτας, τρίτον διδασκάλους, ἔπειτα δυνάμεις, ἔπειτα χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων, ἀντιλήμψεις, κυβερνήσεις, γένη γλωσσῶν.*

called rulers (*προϊστάμενοι*), the foremost men, and to the bishops and deacons, in the ministry (*διακονίαν*). Nor are the officers classified; but yet the first to be mentioned are the prophets. The teacher is also here; but there is silence about apostles, as if Rome had not known hitherto the presence of an apostle. This passage from Romans lacks the definiteness and impressiveness of the account in the Epistle to the Corinthians. St. Paul had not when he wrote visited the church at Rome, and was not as familiar with its arrangements as with the church at Corinth, which he himself had planted and to whom he ministered as an apostle. For this reason his description of the organization of its church may take on this general tone.

In the First Epistle to the Thessalonians (v. 12) we have an allusion to a local ministry, to which, however, no technical designation is given: "We beseech you, brethren, to know them which labor among you (*κοπιῶντας*) and are over you (*προϊσταμένους*) in the Lord, and admonish you." The allusion here may be to those who later became known as the presbyters (*πρεσβύτεροι*) or elders. It is important to call attention to this circumstance, that St. Paul does not mention 'presbyters' when writing to the churches which he had founded, in view of the fact that the writer of the Acts of the Apostles states so positively that it was the usage of the apostle to ordain elders in every church (Acts xiv. 23). It harmonizes the discrepancy if we suppose that the foremost men (*προϊστάμενοι*) mentioned here and in the Epistle to the Romans had become known as presbyters when the writer of the Acts was describing the work of St. Paul.

The Epistle to the Thessalonians may have been written about the year 53 A.D. Some ten years later St. Paul wrote to the Philippians, heading his Epistle, "To the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi with the bishops (*ἐπισκόποις*) and deacons (*διακόνοις*). These names for a local ministry destined to be perpetuated in the church now appear for the first time. They may, however, be here used in a general way, and not yet as titles of office, equivalent to overseers or superintendents and

helpers. There is more than one bishop in this community, as there is also more than one deacon. The coupling together of these two officers may have its significance. They are again mentioned together in the Pastoral Epistles, as also in the Didache, as if united by some organic tie which was wanting in their relation to the presbyters, as if they had grown out of one common root, while the presbyters derived their origin from another source.[1]

If we now compare the information gained from St. Paul with the accounts relating to the organization of the church given in the earlier chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, we find them in substantial agreement. The Twelve Apostles are represented (Acts vi.) as conceiving their mission to be a spiritual one and not as consisting in the administration of ecclesiastical affairs. When, as we are told, there arose a difficulty between the Hellenists and the Hebrews in the community at Jerusalem, because the widows of the former did not receive their due share in the distributions of charity, the Apostles called the disciples together, and said to them: "It is not fit that we should forsake the word of God and serve tables. Look ye out therefore, brethren, from among you seven men of good report, full of the Spirit and of wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. But we will continue steadfastly in prayer and in the ministry of the Word." There is here a sharp distinction drawn between the higher ministry of the Word and the lower ministry of tables or ecclesiastical affairs, which corresponds with St. Paul's classification in the First Epistle to the Corinthians. There is also in these words a vivid reminder of the first commission given by Jesus to the Twelve to go

[1] It is possible that bishops may here include presbyters, as an untechnical designation, in accordance with the usage in Acts xx. 28, where the presbyters are charged to take heed to the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made them overseers or bishops. But the mention in Philippians is connected with a gift of money made to the Apostle, — a circumstance which may have a special significance, in view of the later development of the bishop as an administrative officer who superintended the finances of the community. The presbyter is never mentioned in this connection, but the impression conveyed where the presbyters are mentioned is that of moral supervision and discipline. Cf. Réville, pp. 286 ff.

forth to the lost sheep of the house of Israel: "And as ye go, *preach*, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matt. x. 7); or again, according to St. Mark, "He ordained twelve that they should be with Him and that He might send them forth to *preach*" (Mark iii. 14). In giving this commission to His disciples, Christ was also ordering the continuance of His own mission: "And He said unto them, let us go into the next towns that I may *preach* there also, for therefore came I forth."

The appointment of the Seven to the ministry of the tables, raises the question whether we have in this incident the formal appointment of what is known as the order of deacons. That it is in some way connected with the later appearance of the diaconate must be admitted, while also it may be regarded as a temporary provisional arrangement to meet some special emergency. The Seven are not called deacons, nor are they referred to again in the Acts of the Apostles. Still further, two at least of the Seven soon left the ministry of the tables for the ministry of the Word, — Stephen, whose boldness in preaching waked the first persecution, in consequence of which "they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, except the Apostles"; and Philip, better known as the Evangelist, who went down into Samaria and preached Christ unto them, and to whom the people gave heed with one accord. The essential point in the narrative is not, therefore, the formal constitution of an ecclesiastical order, but the recognition of the Christian ministry as a service (*διακονία*) which is divided into a lower and a higher; and, as Chrysostom remarks, the lower service must needs give way to the higher.[1]

[1] Cf. Chrysostom, *Hom. in Acta Apos.* XIV. Chrysostom asks whether they were deacons who were then appointed, and replies that they were neither deacons nor presbyters. It was Cyprian of Carthage who fixed the traditional interpretation, as in Ep. lxiv. 3, where he is treating the case of a deacon who resisted his bishop. The deacons should be reminded, he says, that Christ himself appointed the apostles, or bishops and overseers; while the deacons, after the ascension of Christ, were appointed by the Apostles as the ministers of their episcopacy. It is God who makes the bishops; it is the bishops who make the deacons.

In appointing assistants for the administration of affairs, the Apostles were vindicating their higher function, which was the preaching of the Word.

II

St. Paul gives the second place after the Apostles, in this higher ministry of the Word, which God had appointed, to the prophet; and with this high estimate of the place of prophecy the Acts of the Apostles agrees. The birth of the Christian church on Pentecost or Whitsunday, following the Ascension, is identified with the pouring out of the Spirit. This mysterious event, whose first effect was a sense of confusion and bewilderment, was interpreted by Peter, in the sermon which he preached, to be the fulfilment of the words of the prophet Joel: "It shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your young men shall see visions, your old men shall dream dreams; and on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy" (Acts ii. 17, 18). If we may distinguish between the apostle and the prophet, between preaching and the act of prophecy, the distinction is this, — the apostle is one *sent*, as the name implies, a messenger to proclaim the Gospel of deliverance to those in darkness. The priority is given to those who thus lay the foundations of Christian communities. They carry a message adapted to this end, they repeat and reiterate the simple truth which they have received and have been commissioned to deliver. They hold firm the tradition which is to bind the world together. As the reception of it has quickened their own souls, so the proclamation of it brings life to others; and the essence of the message is faith in Jesus as the Son of God.

But the prophet speaks to those who have been converted by the preaching of Apostles. If the heavens

might seem to have been closed again after the departure of Christ, yet the proclamation of His teaching and His life would still go on, the form of sound words be repeated and still find an echo in human souls. But primitive Christianity sought and found a higher confirmation of the eternal Gospel. To the prophet the heavens were always open, the Spirit descended upon him, he spoke with the conviction born of fresh and living insight into the truth. He might not have known Christ after the flesh as St. Paul also had not known Him; and yet know the mind of Christ through the Spirit, even as some who had listened to His voice had not been able to do. The prophet had visions in which new truth was revealed, not contradicting the old, but opening and expanding its meaning. Such a vision came to St. Peter, teaching him what he had not learned before, that he was not to call things common or unclean which God had cleansed. The Apostle might speak with the authority of tradition that which he had heard and received from others; the prophet spoke with the authority of immediate inspiration, telling what he saw by spiritual insight and knew to be true, even if it had hitherto found no utterance. What he saw he aimed to make others see. Thus in prophecy there came into the church a new power collateral with tradition, which gave the tradition a new meaning.

And thirdly, as St. Paul tells us, God had appointed teachers, as part of the higher ministry of the Word. This also is confirmed in the earlier chapters of the Acts of the Apostles: "Now there were in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the Tetrarch, and Saul" (Acts xiii. 1). The teacher is the bond of connection between the church and human learning. Apollos was a teacher who is supposed to have been familiar with the wisdom of the schools. The Epistle to the Hebrews is an illustration of the combination between the new faith and the knowledge which is placed at its

disposal. The mission of the teacher was to meet the awakened intellect, to explain difficulties, to solve the problems with which the reason was struggling, embarrassed by a previous training, confused by rival and conflicting systems of philosophy or religion. He gave the information for which the intellect was hungering, as the prophet gave the food for spiritual nourishment.

These three offices or spiritual functions — Apostle, prophet, and teacher — may be said to have belonged to the ministry at large, and were not at first the exclusive possession of the local church. They itinerate, going from place to place, from one Christian community to another, thus constituting the bond of connection and unity which welded the first Christian disciples together in one communion and fellowship. While their gifts and functions were distinct and were held separately, they might also be conjoined in one person. St. Paul combined them in an extraordinary degree. As an Apostle, he did more than they all in planting and superintending churches. But prophecy was a gift which he greatly prized; "Desire spiritual gifts," he wrote to the Corinthians, "but chiefly that ye may prophesy, for he that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification and exhortation and comfort."[1] And again, as a teacher, the first Christian theologian, his name stands in the highest rank. It was this rare combination of gifts which explains the influence and authority of the great Apostle to the Gentiles. There was in St. John also a similar combination, but his Apostolic activity yielded in prominence to his gift as a teacher; he alone in the ancient church received the title of Theologian. In the second century an attempt was made, as in the spurious Clementine writings, to present St. Peter as the foremost teacher of the church, eclipsing St. Paul in his learning, his knowledge of philosophical systems, and his ability to confute every antagonist. But though the functions of

[1] 1 Cor. xiv. 1, 3. The whole chapter is important as giving St. Paul's estimate of prophecy and also as affording a glimpse of early Christian worship. The prophets are to speak two or three, and the others are to judge; ye may all prophesy one by one; the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets, for God is not the author of confusion.

prophecy and teaching might be thus combined in one person, the offices were still distinct, and later history bears witness to this threefold division of the higher ministry of the early church.

III

There are certain features of the office of an Apostle which demand special consideration. The name is applied to the twelve disciples only once in the Gospel according to St. Matthew (x. 2) and once in St. Mark (vi. 30). St. Luke uses it more frequently, saying that the name was given to them by Christ (vi. 13). The more common designation was the Twelve. In the first chapter of the Acts of the Apostles there is contained the intimation that the number twelve was to form the limit of the number of Apostles, as if the chosen disciples would fondly perpetuate the external form of their relationship to the Master. This may have been one reason for the election of Matthias to fill the vacancy created by the apostasy of Judas. But there is no evidence that this method of procedure was followed when other vacancies occurred, or that the effort was again made to restrict the number of the Apostles to twelve. The election of Matthias was also further based upon his possession of a peculiar qualification for the office of Apostle: he had been one of those who had been closely associated with the disciples while Jesus went in and out among them, and was therefore competent to be a witness with them of His resurrection (Acts i. 8; Luke xxiv. 48). It was as if the heroism, the divine energy which the work of an Apostle required, must have its foundation laid deep in this fundamental conviction of a risen Lord. There is also implied here a tradition which is to be handed down, which requires for its attestation the association with Jesus in His earthly life, the concrete vision with the eye of sense of His resurrection from the grave.

But there was another conception of the Apostolate, a larger and freer conception, which was struggling for

recognition in the Apostolic age, not in opposition to but as supplementing the deficiency of the purpose which would restrict its limits to the original Twelve.[1] It was St. Paul who first vindicated for himself and others a right to the title of Apostle, even though he had not been an eyewitness of the resurrection, nor was he of those who had companied with the Lord Jesus as He went in and out among men. As regards temporal things and earthly scenes, he who has seen with his own eyes or been present in person at some great transaction has an advantage over those who hear the report and take the description at second hand. For the historian who is recording events, there is gained vividness of conviction and a deeper sense of reality by visiting the spots where battles were fought or great assemblies were held. But in spiritual things another principle intervenes, — the faith which is the evidence of things not seen. Blessed are they which have not seen and yet have believed. The issue raised by St. Paul was whether the vision of sense, the daily contact and verbal communion with the Master, were the only conditions of the most successful ministry, or whether the spiritual insight was not the primary condition for preaching Christ, and the foundation for the Christian church.

There is given in St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xv. 5–8) a list of the appearances of the risen Christ, in which no distinction is made between the witness of sense and the witness of faith: "He was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve;[2] after that he was seen of five hundred brethren at once; . . . after that he was seen of James; then of all the apostles; and last of all he

[1] For the fullest discussion of Apostles, prophets, and teachers, see Harnack, *Die Lehre der Zwölf Apostel*, in the second volume of *Texte u. Untersuch.*, pp. 111–136. Also Sohm, *Kirchenrecht*, I., pp. 38–51; Lightfoot, on *The Name and Office of an Apostle*, in *Comm. on Galatians*, pp. 92–101; Réville, *Les Origines de l'Épiscopat*, pp. 122–140.

[2] This usage of St. Paul by which he seems to discriminate "the twelve" from the Apostles is illustrated again in 1 Cor. ix. 5: "Have we not power to lead about a sister or a wife as well as other apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord and Cephas?"

was seen of me also." It is to be noted that the Twelve are not here designated as Apostles, nor is Peter or James so described. But the term 'all the apostles' is used in some comprehensive way as if to include those who were divinely sent and had given proof of their divine commission by the fruits of their labors. To this evidence St. Paul appeals in vindication of his own mission, — he had labored more abundantly than they all. Among those who are mentioned in this larger Apostolate are James, the Lord's brother, Barnabas (Acts xiv. 14), Epaphroditus (Phil. ii. 25, *ὑμῶν δὲ ἀπόστολον*; cf. also 1 Thess. ii. 1), Andronicus and Junia, who were of note among the Apostles[1] (Rom. xvi. 7). In the same list may be included Silas and Timotheus. Of Titus and others, it is said by St. Paul that if they be inquired of, they are the Apostles of the churches and the glory of Christ. There is further evidence for the existence of a relatively large number of Apostles, in St. Paul's allusion to the false Apostles; since there could not have been such fraud or counterfeit in the small communities, if the Apostolate had been limited to the Twelve (2 Cor. xi. 13; also Rev. ii. 2).

The claim might be justly made for some of these Apostles that they had been eyewitnesses of the resurrection, and on this ground fulfilled the requisite for the office which the Judæo-Christian conception of it demanded; but it cannot be made for all who are thus named. This claim cannot be made for those Apostles who, according to the Didache, still continued at the close of the first century to visit the churches.[2] In the literature of the second century, traces may be seen of this twofold use of

[1] Cf. Lightfoot, *Comm. on Galatians*, p. 96, who rejects the rendering "highly esteemed by the Apostles" as an effort to escape the difficulty of the larger Apostolate.

[2] Cf. *Didache*, c. XI., where the reference seems to imply a number of Apostles, of whose name or character the churches may be ignorant: "In regard to the Apostles and prophets, according to the ordinance of the Gospel, so do ye. And every Apostle who cometh to you, let him be received as the Lord; but he shall not be allowed to remain more than one day; if, however, there be need, then the next day; but if he remain three days, he is a false prophet."

the term 'Apostle,' some writers limiting the office to the Twelve, with the possible addition of St. Paul, while others take it in the more comprehensive sense; Hermas puts the number at forty;[1] Eusebius speaks of a considerable number of Apostles besides the Twelve.[2]

St. Paul appealed, in confirmation of his call to the Apostolate, not only to the vision vouchsafed him on the way to Damascus, but also to the more tangible evidence, that he had given the proof of an Apostle in his great and successful labors. Nor is the statement an empty one in which he declares, when putting himself in contrast with the twelve Apostles, that he has done more than they all. The only Apostle of whose labors and success in planting churches we have any record in the New Testament is St. Paul. A dense cloud rests over the lives of the Twelve, with the exception of Peter and John, which no research can penetrate. Beyond the circumstances mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles we have no actual knowledge of their labors. They filled up their number, they presided for a while over the church at Jerusalem. They regarded their distinctive work to be the preaching of the Word, and in order to this end appointed assistants who should relieve them from the necessity of administering affairs. They remained in Jerusalem, after the church had been scattered in consequence of the persecution which followed Stephen's preaching, but they felt a responsibility for Samaria when they heard that it had received the Word of God through Philip's preaching. They were interested in the community founded at Antioch, but they do not assume the control of its affairs. It was not one of their own number, but James, the brother of the Lord, who became the leader and president of the church at Jerusalem. They associated with themselves the elders and brethren when great decisions were to be reached. Through the darkness they appear faintly, but always as men of an ideal sanctity of character, as if perpetuating the

[1] Hermas, *Sim.* IX. 15, 16. Clement of Alex. calls Clement of Rome an Apostle, *Strom.* IV. Cf. Lightfoot, *id.*, p. 100.

[2] *H. E.*, I. 2.

divine influence of the Master. At what time they left Jerusalem, or whether they went out of Palestine, and if so whither, these are questions to which no answer based upon actual knowledge can be given. There is abundance of legend which sprang up in the second century regarding their later labors, but no clear historical evidence.[1] As to Peter and John, there is also no evidence that they established churches in the Pauline sense of being their original founders. St. Peter travelled in Palestine; he visited the church at Antioch, but he did not found it. He may have been at Rome not long before his death in 64 A.D., but when he went there, the Christian community had already been in existence for many years. There is no reason for distrusting the tradition that St. John, in his latest years, lived at Ephesus, but the church in Ephesus had already been planted by the preaching of St. Paul.

The commission of the Twelve to preach the Word had been given them by the Master Himself. But in the case of the larger Apostolate, little information is contained in the New Testament as to the mode of their appointment. St. Paul's formal commission came from the prophets and teachers of the church in Antioch; to whom, as they ministered and fasted, "the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. Then, when they had fasted and prayed and laid their hands on them, they sent them away"[2] (Acts xiii. 1). At a later time, St. Paul received, together with Barnabas, "the right hand of fellowship" from James, Cephas, and John, as if the recognition by the Twelve of his mission to the Gentiles. It is interesting to note how

[1] Cf. *Dict. Chris. Biog.*, Article, *The Acts of the Apostles (Apocryphal)* for a valuable discussion of the legendary history of the Apostles, which, taking its rise in the second century, gained a wide circulation, as also the fullest credence.

[2] "The conversion of St. Paul," as Bishop Lightfoot remarks, "may be said in some sense to have been his call to the Apostleship. But the actual investiture, the completion of his call, as may be gathered from St. Luke's narrative, took place some years later at Antioch (Acts xiii. 1). . . . Hitherto both alike (Barnabas and Saul) are styled only prophets. From this point onward, both alike are Apostles."

prophets and teachers here combined with Apostles in sanctioning the origin of the larger Apostolate. In the case of Timothy, who was in some sense an Apostle, — though the name seems to have been withdrawn from him, and he became known to a later age as an evangelist, — there was again a commission given in which the prophetic office shared: "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery" (1 Tim. iv. 14). That the other Apostles were commissioned in this or similar ways, we may assume, but these are the only cases of which the record has been preserved.

In the planting and training of the Christian church, the initiative force was the divine Spirit who bloweth where He listeth. We hear the sound from heaven which shook the place where the disciples were gathered together, — the sound as of a rushing mighty wind. As the winds of heaven scatter the seeds of plants over the surface of the earth and deposit them at their will in unexpected places, so also the seeds of truth, in which germinate the life of the Spirit, were carried abroad by the Pentecostal effusion, as though the human agency were a matter of indifference provided the end be accomplished. The origin of most of the Christian churches, and especially in its great centres Antioch and Alexandria and Rome, and afterwards Constantinople, is unknown. Only we know that the Spirit took the initiative when the Gospel was to be carried into Europe, when Barnabas and Paul were commissioned by prophets and teachers to go forth to their great work. What St. Paul accomplished we know, who was in labors more abundant than they all, and yet it was not so much the man as the grace of God that was in him. In this grace the larger Apostolate also shared, and not without the recognition of the Twelve. The names of some of these Apostles have been preserved, but those of the greater part of them have perished and been forgotten. But it is to this larger Apostolate, and not exclusively to the Twelve, as Bishop Lightfoot has remarked, that the words relate which

declare that *the Church was built on the foundation of Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone.* And in that ancient hymn, *Te Deum*, they are commemorated together before God — "The glorious company of the apostles" and "the goodly fellowship of the prophets."

CHAPTER III

PRESBYTERS, BISHOPS, DEACONS

THOSE epistles of St. Paul to which reference has been made as containing the earliest accounts of the Christian ministry may be considered as documents which belong to the first generation of the Apostolic age. In the decade of the sixties we are entering upon the second generation where changes are impending, — a period of transition in the church which affects its organization as well as the tone of its life and thought. By the year 64 A.D. St. Paul and St. Peter, and doubtless others of the Apostles and of the Twelve, had gone to their rest. In these years occur two events which profoundly disturbed the peace of the church: the persecution under Nero, and the beginning of the war which led to the destruction of Jerusalem. The breaking up of the family, as we may call the Twelve who had been intimately associated with Jesus, was an event of deep significance for the church, because it led to the necessity of providing a substitute for important functions which they had fulfilled. They had been to the church in the place of tradition, handing on the words of the Master, able to recall the details of his teaching and impart it to others in the absence of the book, before the Gospels had as yet assumed their form or become widely disseminated. What was true of the Twelve was also true of their contemporaries, who had come into personal contact with Christ, though not so intimately as his chosen disciples. The earlier generation was passing away, and with it something of the inspired elevation also which marked the attitude of St. Paul.

The first generation of the Apostolic age as it disappeared was followed by the age of the elders or presbyters,

who continue in their degree to bear witness to the things which they have heard. In the documents of this second generation there are allusions to 'presbyters'; in the documents of the earlier period these allusions are wanting altogether. The 'presbyters' are not mentioned by St. Paul, at least by name, in his enumeration of church officers when writing to the Corinthians or the Romans, the Galatians, the Thessalonians, or the Philippians. But the writer of the Acts of the Apostles, when describing in later years the missionary journeys of St. Paul in the land where these churches were planted, states explicitly that Barnabas and Paul ordained them elders (πρεσβυτέρους) in every church (Acts xiv. 23). There is a difficulty here to be explained; but the precedence must be given to St. Paul's own statement, as the one who founded the churches, and watched over them, and knew better than any other their interior organization.

The general impression, then, which is given by these writings of the second generation is that a class of men have come into prominence in the administration of the local churches who are called presbyters or elders. Without attempting to fix the exact date when these documents were written, and without insisting upon any special order in which they are to be reviewed, it may be sufficient to recall the allusions made in them to the presbyters as indicating the prominence of their position.

(1) In the latter part of the Acts of the Apostles there are several of these allusions. The presbyters are associated with the Apostles in the government of the church in Jerusalem as if they stood on an equal footing. When the brethren at Antioch determined to send relief to the brethren which dwelt in Judæa, they sent it to the 'elders' or presbyters by the hands of Barnabas and Saul (Acts xi. 30). These elders are said to have been appointed in every church by Barnabas and Saul (Acts xiv. 23). At the time of the great dissension, which turned on the question of whether the ceremonial law of the Jews was binding on the heathen converts, Paul and Barnabas and certain others went up to Jerusalem "unto the apostles and elders about

this question" (Acts xv. 2), and when they reached there "they were received of the church and of the apostles and elders" (Acts xv. 4), and "the apostles and elders came together for to consider of this matter" (Acts xv. 6). When the decision had been reached, and James had declared his sentence, "it pleased the apostles and elders" to send chosen men of their company to Antioch with a letter after this manner: "The apostles and elders and brethren send greeting," etc. (Acts xv. 22, 23). Again it is said that Paul and Timothy "as they went through the cities delivered them the decrees for to keep that were ordained of the apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem." When Paul was taking his farewell of the church at Ephesus, he called for "the elders of the church," charging them to take heed unto themselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers (ἐπισκόπους, Acts xx. 17, 28).

(2) In the First Epistle of St. Peter, the Apostle exhorts the elders to feed (ποιμάνατε) the flock of God, so that "when the chief shepherd (ἀρχιποίμενος) shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away" (1 Pet. v. 1, 4).

(3) The Epistle General of St. James instructs those who are sick to call for the elders of the church who shall pray over them, etc. (James v. 14).

(4) In the Epistle to Titus it reads: "For this cause left I thee in Crete . . . that thou shouldest ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee" (Titus i, 5).

In all these passages the Greek word for elder is πρεσβύτερος, and these are the only allusions to the Christian ministry. There is silence regarding prophets and teachers, as also bishops and deacons. It is also to be remarked that Peter claims for himself the title or dignity of a presbyter, "I who am also an elder" (συνπρεσβύτερος).

(5) The Epistle to the Ephesians is in marked contrast with these and other documents of this class in that it contains an enumeration of the officers in the church, which reminds us of the earlier generation, and of St. Paul's own description of the ministry in his First Epistle

to the Corinthians: "And he (Christ) gave some apostles; and some prophets; and some evangelists; and some pastors and teachers" (ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους, Eph. iv. 2). If the passage represents an actual situation, it reveals a change in the ecclesiastical order. The Teacher has descended from the third place in the higher ministry described by St. Paul, and for him is substituted the Evangelist, a word which had only a temporary vogue in the transition from the Apostolic to the post-Apostolic age; a designation applied to Timothy, as where he was told to do the work of an 'evangelist'[1] (2 Tim. iv. 5), that is, an assistant to the Apostle, implying inferiority to an Apostle, but superiority to presbyters, bishops, and deacons. The use of the word 'evangelist' may be regarded as the first indication that the larger Apostolate was passing away, that the term 'Apostle' was now beginning to be restricted to the original Twelve, with whom St. Paul alone was henceforth to be associated on equal terms.

In this enumeration of church officers, neither presbyters, bishops, or deacons are mentioned. But there is a class of officers called pastors and teachers, who combine the two functions of pastoral care and teaching. The word 'pastor' (ποιμήν) was one of the many tentative terms in a period of transition which did not win final acceptance. The word suggests a double tendency or direction in

[1] Philip is called an Evangelist in Acts xxi. 8. For a discussion of the relation of these terms 'Apostle' and 'evangelist,' cf. Réville, *Orig. de l'Épis.*, pp. 137 ff. and pp. 244 ff.: "Une espèce de colporteurs des dires de Jésus et des récits concernant sa vie et sa mort, dépourvus de l'autorité que les apôtres tiennent du Christ, terrestre ou glorifié, et que les prophètes tiennent de l'Esprit divin dont ils sont inspirés. Ce n'est pas sans bonne raison que les rédacteurs des écrits où furent consignés plus tard par écrit les faits et gestes de Jésus et les paroles de lui que la tradition orale avait conservées, furent appelés évangélistes. Ils firent en écrivant la même œuvre que leurs prédécesseurs faisaient en parlant" (p. 140). It is mentioned as a prerogative of the Evangelist that he appoints presbyters (cf. 2 Tim. i. 5). But the later bishop did not inherit this prerogative. According to the usage of the Catholic church a presbyter is not ordained by the bishop alone, as is the deacon, but by the bishop in conjunction with the presbyters, who act together in the laying on of hands, — a relic of the earlier day when the highest distinction of the bishop lay in his belonging to the class of the presbyters.

the ministry of the local church. On the one hand, there is the function of feeding the flock, which recalls the presbyter as his duties are defined by St. Paul in his farewell address at Miletus, "Feed the church of God" (Acts xx. 28); or again by St. Peter when exhorting the presbyters, "Feed the flock of God" (1 Pet. v. 2, 4). But superintendence is also suggested, for which the word is oversight, or episcopacy; as again in the same passage from St. Paul, "Take heed unto the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers" (*ἐπισκόπους*); or St. Peter, "Ye are now returned unto the bishop and shepherd of your souls" (*ποιμένα καὶ ἐπίσκοπον*). The word 'pastor' or 'shepherd' wavers between these two officers, presbyter and bishop, and from its use no exact conclusion can be drawn[1] (cf. Her. *Sim.* ix. 31).

[1] There is another tentative word for the ministry in the Epistle to the Hebrews, which also failed to become domesticated in common use: "Remember them that have the rule over you" where the Greek is *ἡγουμένων* (cf. Heb. xiii. 7, 17). It may be used here in a general way and not in a technical. The natural affiliation of the word is with the presbyterate, which, like the Apostolate, had the cure of souls; they are further described as those that "watch for your souls" (v. 17). But the same word is also employed by Clement of Rome in his Epistle to the Corinthians, where it refers to officers other than the presbyters, who seem to be above presbyters and yet are not bishops (cf. Clem. Rom., cc. i. and xxi.). For this reason they have been identified with the prophets (so Ritschl, Harnack), an order which still continued to exist in the earlier years of the second century. According to the Didache, if the local church appoints bishops and deacons, they will be to them for prophets and are to be honored as such. On the other hand, Weizsäcker sees in the *ἡγούμενοι* the superintendents of the local churches, corresponding to the bishops of the Pastoral Epistles (V. 2, § 2). Réville also takes a similar view (cf. pp. 389, 415). In the Acts of the Apostles, the prophets are called *ἡγούμενοι*; as in Acts xv. 22, where it is said that the Apostles and elders with the whole church sent chosen men of their own company to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas; namely, Judas surnamed Barsabas and Silas, chief men (*ἄνδρας ἡγουμένους*) among the brethren; and in verse 32 it is said that Judas and Silas were prophets. Cf. Her. *Vis.* ii. 26 and iii. 9. 7, where the prophets are also called *ἡγούμενοι*.

No account has been taken here of the Book of Revelation, because its figurative allusions throw little or no light upon the actual organization of the church. Cf. Lightfoot, *Essay*, etc., pp. 199, 200, whose reasoning seems conclusive: "The angels of the seven churches are not ecclesiastical officers." So also Weizsäcker: "The angels of the seven churches are not really relevant. They were, from i. 16. 20, spirits and as such always personified the churches" (*Das apost. Zeit*, V. 2, § 3).

(6) As one passes into the atmosphere in which the Pastoral Epistles were written, there is the attendant consciousness of a change in the situation of the churches, a sense of exigency, as though evils were pressing upon them both from within and without. These epistles are more directly occupied with the question of church organization, as if therein lay a remedy for the dangers of the hour. In the constitution of the church as it is here described, there is no longer any allusion to the prophets, and so far as there is any mention of the teacher, it is by way of warning, as if the teachers had fallen into disrepute (1 Tim. vi. 3–5). The Apostle, also, is absent, but in his place is a delegate known as an evangelist, who will carry on his work after his final departure. The presbyters appear now as if officials (1 Tim. v. 17, 19), and again as if a class in the community, the older men as compared with the younger[1] (1 Tim. v. 1, 2). The highest honor is accorded them; even the evangelist is not to rebuke them, but entreat them as fathers; no accusation is to be received against them except in the presence of two or three witnesses. Those presbyters who rule well are to be accounted worthy of double honor, especially those who labor in the Word and doctrine.[2] But while the presbyters are thus honored, they seem to stand somewhat in the background and are vaguely drawn. It may have been that their position and duties were too familiar to need

[1] Cf. 1 Pet. v. 5. "Likewise, ye younger (*νεώτεροι*), submit yourselves unto the elder (*πρεσβυτέροις*)." This same usage is still followed in the Epistle of the Roman Clement to the Corinthians, cc. i., iii. But it is quite possible that these two aspects of the presbyter were prominent in the consciousness of the community at the same time. He was an official with recognized duties, but had attained this honor as one of a class, the older members to whom the young owed obedience for a double reason, — their age as well as their position.

[2] Whether these ruling and teaching presbyters are to be identified with the bishops is a question which the Pastoral Epistles do not in themselves give sufficient material for determining. The bishop's qualifications include aptness to teach and the ability to refute the gainsayers, but also the gift of ruling. If we hold that they are not identical offices, then there were in the church at Ephesus these five orders or ranks of office: evangelists, teaching elders, ruling elders, bishops, and deacons. But if they are to be identified, then there are only three ranks, — evange-

definition, or that they were too indefinite for exact description. But however this may be, the qualifications of the bishop are mentioned at length, as are also those of the deacons.

In this respect, the First Epistle to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus stand forth in marked contrast with the other documents which describe the organization of the church in the second generation, — they assign to the bishop and the deacon important posts in the administration of the local church, and the words 'bishop' and 'deacon' are not used in a general untechnical way, but have become the fixed designations of their respective offices. That the qualifications for these offices should be mentioned with such emphasis and fine discrimination, does not, indeed, indicate that these offices are new, but does show that they have been growing in importance since the first and sole allusion to them by name made by St. Paul when writing to the gentile Christian church in Philippi (Phil. i. 1). Whether there was a plurality of bishops in the church at Ephesus over which Timothy was placed as an evangelist, or only one bishop, is perhaps still an open question. It was a plural episcopate to which St. Paul referred in the church at Philippi, and it was still a plural episcopate in the churches of Rome and Corinth at the close of the first century, as also in the community described in the Didache. What seems like an allusion to a single bishop in 1 Tim. iii. 1, 2 (cf. Titus i. 7), especially in comparison with the plural diaconate (1 Tim. iii. 8), may be the desire to call special attention to the grave importance of the office. But however this may be, there can be no doubt as to the nature of the office to which the bishop is called. The qualifications which he must possess are those of a pastor, who is to teach and rule the church; and to this end he must be endowed with

lists, bishops, and deacons, — and in this case there is plainly a plurality of bishops. The probability is that bishop and presbyter are not the same office nor are the names interchangeable, but the bishops are chosen from the presbyterate for a special work, and while retaining their high position and honor as presbyters, are yet also known by a special title.

the higher Christian virtues; he must have also a good report in the heathen world outside the church (1 Tim. iii. 2–7; Titus ii. 6–9). There is a tradition to be maintained, a form of sound words to be defended against those who are perverting the truth. Heretics are to be resisted, and the mouths of false teachers to be stopped. According to the Epistle to Titus, the danger is from Judaizing teachers; in the Epistles to Timothy it comes from gentile heathen sources. There is also serious cause for solicitude from the hostility it may be of the State and from this present evil world. But whatever may be the depth or extent of this external danger, it does not intimidate the church, but rather rouses in it the spirit of defiance out of which is born the tendency toward a closer, more centralized organization in order to meet more effectively the impending evil.[1]

(7) The Second Epistle of John reveals to us a presbyter chiefly solicitous concerning the invasion of the church by heresy and calling attention to the tradition which was from the beginning as the safeguard against the danger (2 John 6–10.). The Third Epistle of John is written by the same presbyter, who also mentions again that he is a presbyter, as if therein lay his credentials of honor and authority. There is here the disclosure of a troubled condition within the church itself, owing to a struggle for the pre-eminence among its officers: "I wrote unto the church: but Diotrephes, who loveth to have the pre-eminence among them, receiveth us not. Wherefore, if I come, I will remember his deeds which he doeth, prating against us with malicious words: and not content therewith, neither doth he himself receive the brethren, and forbiddeth them that would, and casteth them out of the church" (3 John, 9, 10). The allusion is obscure, but is sufficient to indicate that the organization of the

[1] Cf. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, on the influence of the Flavian persecution on the organization of the church and the development of the Christian ministry, pp. 252–374. Professor Ramsay follows the conservative tradition in placing the date of the Pastoral Epistles not far from the year 67 A.D., p. 365.

church was not fixed without a struggle. The time and place of both these epistles is unknown. If they fall within the Apostolic age, it must be in the latest years of the second generation, as it verges into a new period. They may serve as a connection with the Epistle of the Roman Clement to the Corinthians, which reveals a greater disturbance in the church at Corinth.[1]

[1] If we may sum up the impression produced by this general survey of the literature of the second generation, it may be said to indicate the predominance of the presbyter in the organization of the local church. So also Bishop Lightfoot: "It is clear that at the close of the Apostolic age the two lower orders of the threefold ministry were firmly and widely established; but traces of the third and highest order, the episcopate, properly so called, are few and indistinct" (*Essay on the Christian Ministry* in *Comm. on Philippians*, p. 195, ed. 1891).

CHAPTER IV

THE AGE OF TRANSITION

THERE are four important documents belonging to the earlier years of the post-Apostolic age, or to what may be called the third of the Christian generations. They are the Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, the Didache, or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, the Shepherd of Hermas, and the letters of Ignatius. The dates of the Didache and the Shepherd of Hermas are not definitely fixed, and therefore the order in which these four treatises are considered is hypothetical and subject to revision. The time of Clement's Epistle is about the year 97 A.D.; the Ignatian Epistles may be placed between the years 112 A.D. and 117 A.D. The Didache and the Shepherd of Hermas may have been written earlier or later than the time of Ignatius; while this uncertainty must be borne in mind, it does not greatly modify our knowledge of the development of the Christian ministry in its more prominent features.

I

Clement of Rome, who wrote the Epistle to the Corinthians, can only with difficulty be identified with the Clement mentioned by St. Paul as his fellow-laborer (Phil. iv. 3).[1] His epistle has affiliations with the Epistle to the Hebrews, as shown by his allusions to

[1] For a discussion of the character of Clement and his position in the church at Rome, cf. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, Part I., Vol. I., who holds that he cannot be identified with the Clement mentioned in Phil. iv. 3. Lightfoot's translation has been followed in the critical passages quoted from Clement. Cf. also Wrede, *Untersuchungen zum Ersten Klemensbriefe*, 1892, who adds much to our insight into this famous epistle.

the Old Testament and to Jewish ceremonial (cc. xl., xli.). In view of later developments in the Roman church, it is significant that he does not write in his own name, but in the name of the whole church, an evidence of the democratic ordering of the community. His superscription reads, "The Church of God which sojourns at Rome to the Church of God which sojourns at Corinth," as if his predominant mood were the conviction that here we have no enduring city. He had been consulted by members of the church at Corinth about troubles which had risen among them and had delayed his reply in consequence of sudden and calamitous events in Rome, — a reference, it may be, to the disturbances under the Emperor Domitian. It has sometimes been claimed that we have here the first instance of an appeal to Rome. But the letter of Clement is no more evidence for the primacy of Rome than are the letters of Ignatius an evidence of the primacy of Antioch. If a certain tone of authority is apparent, the reflex, it may be, of the pride of the Eternal City, there is also in the writings of Ignatius a conviction of a higher authority, as if he spoke by immediate revelation of God.

The letter of Clement opens with expressions of admiration and praise for the church at Corinth, its sobriety and moderation, its magnificent hospitality, its perfect and well-grounded knowledge, its kindness and charity and willingness to forgive, and the peace which had marked its career. But there is no reference to St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians, in which a different state of affairs was pictured. The obedience of the Corinthians to the commandments of God is specially commended (c. i.): "you were obedient to them that had the rule over you (*ἡγουμένοις*), and gave all fitting honor to the presbyters among you" (*πρεσβυτέροις*). The cause of the disturbance was that "the worthless rose up against the renowned, the foolish against the wise, the young against those advanced in years" (c. iii., *νέοι ἐπὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους*). Clement then proceeds to enjoin obedience at some length and with illustrations from the Old Testament, and along with

obedience, the virtue of humility. Again there is an allusion to the disturbance at Corinth (c. xiv.) as a "detestable emulation," caused by "pride and sedition," by men who aim at exciting "strife and tumults." Against the authors of sedition is set over, in contrast, obedience to God, as if the constituted authorities in the church represented His will: "Let us esteem those who have the rule over us (*προηγουμένους*), let us honor our presbyters (or our aged men, *πρεσβυτέρους*), let us train up the young in the fear of God"[1] (c. xxi.).

The greater part of the epistle is occupied with thus laying the foundation in general reasoning and exhortation, for the special message which Clement has for the church at Corinth. This message is finally introduced in a manner which indicates that Clement lays claim to the prophetic office: "Since these things therefore are manifest to us, *and since we have searched into the depths of the divine knowledge*" (c. xl.). What, then, is the burden of the prophetic injunction?

"We ought to do all things in order, as many as the Master hath commanded us to perform at their appointed seasons. Now the offerings and ministrations He commanded to be performed with care, and not to be done rashly or in disorder, but at fixed times and seasons. And where and by whom He would have them performed, He Himself fixed by His supreme will; that all things being done with piety according to His good pleasure might be acceptable to His will. They therefore that make their offerings at the appointed season are acceptable and blessed; for while they follow the institutions of the Master they cannot go wrong. For unto the high priest his proper services have been assigned, and to the priests their proper office is appointed, and upon the Levites their proper ministrations are laid. The layman is bound by the laymen's ordinances" (c. xl.).

"Let each of you, brethren, in his own order give thanks unto God, maintaining a good conscience and not transgressing the appointed rule of his service, but acting with all seemliness. Not in every place, brethren, are the continual daily sacrifices offered or the

[1] This allusion to the rulers and presbyters is followed in the next sentence by a reference to the young men (*νέοις*), who were enjoined to be modest. Hence Lightfoot translates, "submitting yourselves to your rulers and rendering the older men among you the honor which is their due," *i.e.* the presbyters here are a class in the community and not officials.

free will offerings or the sin offerings and the trespass offerings, but in Jerusalem alone. And even there the offering is not made in every place, but before the sanctuary in the court of the altar; and this too through the high priest and aforesaid ministers" (c. xli).[1]

We have in this passage the analogy of the Christian ministry with the Jewish priesthood, which was to be applied with greater force and exactness by Cyprian in the third century, and was to become the ruling idea of the Middle Ages. That which Christ had done away, when he declared to the woman in Samaria the nature of Christian worship, is now to be restored; "Neither in this mountain (Gerizim) nor yet at Jerusalem shall men worship the Father. But the hour cometh and now is when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth." We have here, also, the first intimation of the sharp line of division which was at a later time to separate the clergy from the laity.

Clement proceeds, in the next place, to enforce the Roman doctrine of the transmission of authority through the unbroken chain of verbal commission:

"The Apostles received the Gospel for us from the Lord Jesus Christ; Jesus Christ was sent forth from God. So then Christ is from God, and the Apostles are from Christ. Both therefore came

[1] "Ce curieux chapitre, où la thèse sacerdotale s'affirme pour la première fois dans toute sa crudité, dénote que les rebelles de Corinthe ne voulaient pas se conformer aux instructions de leurs dignitaires pour la célébration de l'eucharistie et la tenue des agapes, — ce qui explique l'intervention de la police corinthienne. Non seulement ils ne veulent pas observer les jours et heures fixés par leurs pasteurs, mais ils ne tiennent pas compte des règles déterminant quelles personnes ont le droit de faire des offrandes, en d'autres termes, ils méconnaissent les prérogatives de leurs épiscopes. Ils n'ont pas encore accepté la distinction du λαϊκὸς ἄνθρωπος opposé aux prêtres et aux lévites. Ils ont le grand tort d'avoir conservé le vieil esprit démocratique de la communauté paulinienne, de ne pas se plier aux prétentions de leurs gouvernants et de les destituer, suivant la vieille tradition hellénique, lorsque ceux-ci ne veulent pas exécuter les décisions de l'assemblée souveraine. . . . C'est tout simplement un incident, — d'autant plus remarquable pour nous qu'il est le seul dont le souvenir est conservé, — d'une lutte qui dut se répéter dans plusieurs autres églises grecques et les tendances autoritaires qui se dévellopent chez les presbytres et les épiscopes par le fait même des conditions dans lesquelles ils exercent leurs fonctions." Réville, *His. de l'Épis.*, pp. 404, 405.

of the will of God in the appointed order. Having therefore received a charge, and having been fully assured through the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ and confirmed in the Word of God with full assurance of the Holy Ghost, they went forth with the glad tidings that the kingdom of God should come. So preaching everywhere in country and town, they appointed their firstfruits, when they had proved them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons unto them that should believe. And this they did in no new fashion; for indeed it had been written concerning bishops and deacons from very ancient times; for thus saith the Scripture in a certain place, 'I will appoint their bishops in righteousness and their deacons in faith'"[1] (c. xlii.).

It is important to note here that bishops and deacons are mentioned together as having some close and peculiar tie, and that they are specially related to the worship of the church at stated times and places; it is their function to receive and present the offerings. A similar reminder is found in the allusion to 'bishops and deacons' in the Epistle to the Philippians, where they are mentioned in connection with the acknowledgment of a gift of money to the apostle; that is, an offering. Bishops and deacons were again connected in the First Epistle to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus, where the qualifications for both offices include a warning against covetousness and the love of money. The next statement, that the Apostles appointed the firstfruits of their labors to be bishops and deacons, is hard to reconcile with the statement in Acts (xiv. 23; cf. Titus i. 5) that "they appointed presbyters in every city," as also with the prominence of the presbyters in the second generation. If there is any authority for Clement's statement in the documents already reviewed, it must be in the account mentioned in the sixth chapter of the Acts, where a trouble arose about the distribution of the funds or offerings, and the Apostles set apart the Seven, who should be men of honest report, to the ministry of the tables. And as the ministry of the tables was clearly connected with the *agape*, or earlier form of keeping the

[1] The quotation is inexact. Cf. LXX., Is. lx. 17, δώσω τοὺς ἄρχοντας σου ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ τοὺς ἐπισκόπους σου ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, "I will make thy officers peace and thy exactors righteousness." Cf. Lightfoot, *Apos. Fathers*, Part I., Vol. II., p. 129.

Lord's supper, the Seven also must have been closely connected with the worship of the church and the ordering of its details. The original diaconate of the tables, as contrasted with the ministry of the Word, which the Apostles reserved to themselves, may then have expanded into this twofold order, — the bishops, who preside and have the function of oversight, and the deacons, who help them in the fulfilment of their office. The authority of an apostle for this arrangement may be further indicated in the function of the ministry, which is designated by St. Paul 'helps' (*ἀντιλήμψεις*), in his enumeration of the grades of the ministry as God hath appointed them (1 Cor. xii. 28). The expansion of the "helps" into bishops and deacons was then a simple and natural process. The authority of St. Paul may be seen also in his mention of the *diaconia*, in his Epistle to the Romans, where they that minister are exhorted to wait on their ministring. That those who were thus appointed were the firstfruits of the Apostolic teaching is a statement warranted by the account of the appointment of the Seven, as well as by the nature of the case. But Clement does not assign to bishops and deacons the functions of teaching or of ruling: they serve the church in the ministry of the tables, — they present the offerings and perform the service; for God has appointed the performance with care of the offerings and ministrations (*προσφορὰς καὶ λειτουργίας*, c. xl.).

The office of the bishops must have been growing in importance from its first appearance, especially as, with the increase of the congregations, the offerings also increased, and the necessity for the orderly performance of the service. The questions, therefore, of the mode of appointment to the office and the duration of its tenure, or whether it should be for life, became issues of immediate exigency. On this subject Clement writes:

"And our Apostles knew through our Lord Jesus Christ that there would be strife over the name of the bishop's office. For this cause therefore, having received complete foreknowledge, they appointed the aforesaid persons, and afterwards they provided a continuance, that if these should fall asleep, other approved men should succeed

to their ministration. Those therefore who were appointed by them, or afterward by other men of repute with the consent of the whole Church, and have ministered unblamably to the flock of Christ in lowliness of mind, peacefully and with all modesty and for a long time have borne a good report with all, — these men we consider to be unjustly thrust out from their ministration. For it will be no light sin for us, if we thrust out those who have offered the gifts of the bishop's office unblamably and holily. Blessed are those presbyters who have gone before, seeing that their departure was fruitful and ripe: for they have no fear lest any one should remove them from their appointed place" (c. xliv.).

Upon this passage it may be remarked that the first statement in regard to the Apostles' foreknowledge of a struggle over the episcopate, concerning which Christ had taught them, is Clement's own inference or theory, and not borne out by any special source of information to which he had access. He reasoned from his knowledge of the working of human nature. He also lays an emphasis upon the consciousness of this foreknowledge among the Apostles which may be the result of his own meditation. But in a general way there are many warnings in the teachings of Christ and of His Apostles regarding an unhallowed ambition for high places in the kingdom of God, or the desire to be lords over God's heritage or the necessity of humility and of taking the lowest place; "He that will be chief among you, let him be your minister."[1] From these allusions Clement may have drawn his inference. But in regard to one point, which was to become of supreme interest to the later church, Clement is silent. Beyond the statement that when the bishops and deacons whom Apostles had appointed should fall asleep, others should take their place whom men of repute should appoint, with the approval of the whole church, — beyond this general statement no light is thrown upon the method of continuing the office of the bishops. These men of repute may have been the prophets or the presbyters, whom Clement has already mentioned. It may also be inferred from Clement's statement about the injustice of

[1] Cf. Matt. xx. 25; Luke xiv. 7; 1 Cor. xii.; 1 Pet. v. 3; 1 Tim. iii. 1; 3 John 9.

dismissing those from the ministry who had performed its duties in a holy and blameless way, that hitherto the office of the bishop or of the deacon had not been regarded as a life office, and was not so regarded in the church at Corinth by all its members. And one other inference may be drawn, that the bishops were taken from the ranks of the presbyters and had, therefore, a double claim to honor and influence. But it looks as if their highest distinction still lay in belonging to the presbyterate.

The remaining allusions in Clement's Epistle add nothing to our information regarding the exact nature of the disturbance in the church at Corinth. We may assume on his authority that it was a sedition disgraceful and unworthy of the Christian profession (c. xlvii.), and that its leaders, who belonged to the younger part of the congregation, were rightly called upon to repent and submit to the presbyters set over them (cc. liv., lvii.). Clement does not apparently speak as one who has made diligent inquiry and listened to both the parties in dispute. He sides with the constituted authorities, whoever they were, and condemns resistance as sin. There may have been some movement in the church at Corinth which had a deep significance for the later development of the ministry, but, if so, it can only be a remote inference from the information which Clement has given. But incidentally we learn something regarding the organization of the church in both these places at the close of the first century. There were in Rome the leaders or rulers of the church (ἡγούμενοι), who may have been the prophets; there were a class known as the presbyters, from whom the ranks of the bishops and deacons were recruited; there was still a plural episcopate at Rome and at Corinth, and the single bishop had not yet appeared. It may have been that the sedition of the church at Corinth was an effort to place the single bishop above the presbyters, and to this end deprive the presbyters, who had hitherto officiated as bishops, of their office. Clement himself must have belonged to the leaders or rulers, and have been the foremost man in the Roman church, as his epistle would indicate that he

deserved to be, and as tradition has represented him. After the middle of the second century, when the monarchical episcopate had been established, he was called the Bishop of Rome, which corresponded rightly enough with the later organization, but is an anachronism if we speak from the point of view of his own age.

II

The Shepherd of Hermas may have been written soon after the Epistle of Clement.[1] It was a popular book in the second century, read in the churches for edification, referred to as Scripture by Irenæus, and regarded by Origen as divinely inspired. The author was a prophet who had a message for his age, whose aim was to protest against the moral laxity of the time rather than against false teaching. There is no direct description of the ministry, nor has the author any special interest in ecclesiastical organization, as a cure for the existing evils. There are incidental references to the ministry, but we encounter the same difficulty as in earlier documents, when we ask whether designations are used in a technical or non-technical way.

(1) Apostles are mentioned in a list of officers, as among the stones fitted into the temple which is in process of erection: "Apostles, bishops, teachers, and deacons" (Vis. iii. 5). But no further allusion is made to them; there is a possible intimation that they have passed away.

(2) The prophets still exist as an order, with whom Hermas has the deeper sympathy. The prophet is spoken of as occupying the chair while others occupy the seats. But there are false prophets, and it becomes necessary to instruct the congregation how they are to tell the false prophet from the true. The test is a simple one: "He

[1] The date of the composition of the Shepherd of Hermas is undetermined. It is placed by Zahn about 97 A.D., by Lipsius about 142 A.D. Cf. Zahn, *Der Hist. des Hermas*, 1868; Gebhardt and Harnack, *Patres Apostolici*.

who has the Divine Spirit proceeding from above is meek, peaceable, and humble, and refrains from all iniquity and the vain desire of this world and contents himself with fewer wants than those of other men, and when asked he makes no reply; nor does he speak privately; nor when man wishes the spirit to speak does the Holy Spirit speak, but it speaks only when God wishes it to speak" (Mand. xi.).

(3) Teachers are mentioned among the officers of the church, intervening between bishops and deacons. That they are not to be identified with presbyters may be inferred from the manner in which the presbyters are described. If the Shepherd were written at Rome, and describes the life of the church there, it is not strange that Hermas should not magnify the office. Rome was never at any time strong in her local teachers. But Hermas also has no great interest in theology or in the intellectual aspects of the faith. He divorces piety from the intellect, and is concerned with moral reform and the cultivation of an inward faith. There is one allusion to teachers "as praising themselves in having wisdom, and desiring to become teachers, although destitute of sense." But the reference here may be to Gnostics. (Sim. ix. 22.)

(4) Presbyters are mentioned as having the government of the church, or as a privileged class, but whether always as a class in the community or as individual office-holders may be doubtful. But Hermas has no liking for presbyter or for bishop, speaking of them to their disparagement, accusing them of self-seeking and ambition: "They are emulous of each other about the foremost places" (Sim. viii. c. 7; Vis. ii. c. 4; Vis. iii. c. 1).

(5) Bishops are given in the list of officials (Vis. iii. c. 5) and also deacons. The bishops are spoken of as having obtained a special reward according to the revelation which Hermas was receiving, while their duties are also incidentally described:

"Bishops given to hospitality, who always gladly received into their houses the servants of God without dissimulation. And the bishops never failed, by their service, the widows and those who were in want

and always maintained a holy conversation. All these accordingly shall be protected by the Lord forever. They who do these things are honorable before God, and their place is already with the angels, if they remain to the end serving God" (Sim. ix. 27).

But in this ideal picture of the church in the prophet's mind there appear "deacons who have stains upon them, who discharged their duty ill, and who plundered widows and orphans of their livelihood and gained possessions for themselves from the ministry which they had received" (Sim. ix. 26).

There is another passage where Hermas manifests his dislike of certain officials, who are spoken of as "those who preside over the church and love the first seats" (*τοῖς προηγουμένοις τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τοῖς πρωτοκαθεδρίταις*, Vis. iii. 9). If we interpret the passage in accordance with the usage of the next generation (Justin, *Apol.* lxvii.), those who are here designated "leaders" or "presidents" may be the bishops, and those who seek the first seats are those ambitious of the place of presbyters; as in the ancient familiar picture of the celebration of the Lord's supper, where the bishop sits in the centre of the apse with presbyters on either side. There is also an intimation here that these officials are charged with the duty of instructing the people, which was soon to become one of their recognized functions and may have begun to be so already: "Take heed, therefore, children, that these dissensions of yours do not deprive you of your life. How will you instruct the elect of the Lord, if you yourselves have not instruction?"[1]

[1] Hermas makes one other allusion to the ministry, in Sim. ix. 31: "If He find any one of these sheep strayed, woe to the shepherds! And if the shepherds themselves have strayed, what answer will they give Him for their flocks?" Whether the allusion is to bishops as distinct from presbyters, or to presbyters as a class, is uncertain. For the earlier use of the word "shepherd" in connection with the ministry, cf. Acts xx. 28; Eph. iv. 11; 1 Pet. v. 2, 4, and ii. 25.

III

The Didache, or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles,[1] has a kindred tone with the Shepherd of Hermas, — a certain archaic quality which bespeaks its great antiquity. If we are not certain of its place in the chronological order, yet in the logical order it precedes the writings of Ignatius. Its value consists in revealing the process of the transition from the ministry of the Apostolic age to the Catholic church of the second century. The information which it gives on the organization of the church has greatly modified the whole method of treating the origin of the Christian ministry. Imperfect as the picture may still be, it is owing to the Didache that its recovery in outline has been possible. The passages bearing on the subject read as follows:

"Now whoever cometh and teacheth you all these things, before spoken, receive him; but if the teacher himself turn aside and teach another teaching, so as to overthrow this, do not hear him; but if he teach so as to promote righteousness and knowledge of the Lord, receive him as the Lord. But in regard to the apostles and prophets, according to the ordinance of the gospel, so do ye. And every apostle who cometh to you, let him be received as the Lord; but he shall not

[1] Διδαχὴ τῶν Δώδεκα Ἀποστόλων, or the complete title, *Teaching of the Lord through the Twelve Apostles to the Nations.* For the fuller discussion of its contents cf. Harnack, *Die Lehre des Zwölf Apostel*, 1884, who also gives a condensed synopsis and criticism of its contents in Schaff-Herzog, *Encyc.* Art. *Didache*, at end of the first volume; English translations of the Didache, with notes, etc., by Hitchcock and Brown, 1885; Schaff, *The Oldest Church Manual*, 1885, and others. Cf. also *Andov. Rev.* 1886, for a study by McGiffert, and *Bib. Sac.* 1886, by Warfield. The literature on the Didache is already voluminous. Cf. Schaff for list, with criticism. The earliest date for the Didache assigned by Harnack is A.D. 70, and the latest 165. The place of its composition is not determined. Use of it was made by Clem. Alex. and Origen. It is referred to by Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 25) as not to be ranked with books entitled to a place in the Canon. Athanasius, in his Festal Letters (Ep. 39), mentions it with the Shepherd of Hermas, as suitable to be read for edification in the churches. It is also connected with the *Epistle of Barnabas*, and was worked up into the writings known as *The Apostolic Constitutions.* The manuscript containing the Didache was discovered by Bryennios in 1873 in the Jerusalem Convent in Constantinople. It was first published in 1883.

remain more than one day; if, however, there need be, then the next day; but if he remain three days, he is a false prophet. But when the apostle departeth, let him take nothing except bread enough till he lodge again; but if he ask money, he is a false prophet. And every prophet who speaketh in the spirit, ye shall not try nor judge; for every sin shall be forgiven, but this sin shall not be forgiven. But not every one that speaketh in the spirit is a prophet, but only if he have the ways of the Lord. So from their ways shall the false prophet and the prophet be known. And no prophet who orders a meal, in the spirit, eateth of it, unless indeed he is a false prophet; and every prophet who teacheth the truth, if he do not that which he teacheth, is a false prophet. But every prophet, proved, true, acting with a view to the mystery of the church on earth, but not teaching others to do all that he himself doeth, shall not be judged among you; for with God he hath his judgment; for so did the ancient prophets also. But whoever, in the spirit, says: Give me money, or something else, ye shall not hear him; but if for others in need, he bids you give, let no one judge him. . . .

"But every true prophet who will settle among you is worthy of his support. Likewise a true teacher, he also is worthy, like the workman, of his support. Every firstfruit, then, of the products of wine-press and threshing-floor, of oxen and of sheep, thou shalt take and give to the prophets; for they are your high-priests. But if ye have no prophet, give it to the poor. If thou makest a baking of bread, take the first of it and give according to the commandment. In like manner when thou openest a jar of wine or oil, take the first of it and give to the prophets; and of money, and clothing, and every possession take the first, as seems right to thee, and give according to the commandment. . . .

"Now appoint for yourselves bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord, men meek and not avaricious, and upright, and proved; for they, too, render you the service of the prophets and teachers. Despise them not, therefore; for they are the ones who are honored of you, together with the prophets and teachers" (cc. xi., xiii., xv.).[1]

From this account it is evident, (1) that the order of the ministry as described by St. Paul (1 Cor. xii. 28) was still maintained in some of the churches, so late as the close of the first or the earlier years of the second century, but it is seen at the moment when it is passing away. (2) Apostles, prophets, and teachers are mentioned, but it would seem as if Apostles were becoming rare, and also as if the office were growing larger and diviner in the

[1] Cf. ed. by Hitchcock and Brown, New York, 1886.

popular imagination as the years receded. This may be inferred from the statement that if any one visited the communities as an Apostle who proved to be false by the ring of his teaching or life, he was not a false Apostle but a false prophet. (3) The prophet occupies the highest place of honor in the congregation. He not only has a message to give, but he officiates in the Eucharist as a high priest; and while others use a formula of prayer in its administrations, the prophet is to be allowed to give thanks as much as he will. (4) But the prophetic order has begun to be discredited through the number of false prophets, and every community must be on its guard lest it suffer imposition. The test is a simple one, whether for teachers or prophets, — the utterance must be evidenced as true by the life; and any Apostle, prophet, or teacher who exploits his office at the expense of the community, ordering meals or tarrying too long in one place, reveals his insincerity. (5) Apostles, prophets, and teachers constitute at first an itinerating ministry, the larger bond which unites the scattered communities into an organic whole. (6) The functions of Apostles, prophets, and teachers are exclusively spiritual, or relate to the higher ministry of the Word. But there is a local ministry, also, whose functions hitherto have been of an administrative character; these are the bishops and deacons, — the ministry of the tables (Acts vi.) or the "helps" referred to by St. Paul (1 Cor. xii. 28; Rom. xii. 7). (7) There are two ways by which the transition was effected from the earlier to the later form of the ministry. Prophets and teachers might remain permanently with any community, in which case they were to be supported as worthy of their hire. The firstfruits were to be theirs, as in the Jewish economy: "for they are your high priests." (8) But there was another way which might be followed when it was no longer convenient to receive prophets and teachers; the congregation might appoint (χειροτονήσατε) for themselves bishops and deacons, who would take upon them the functions of prophets and teachers and would be the recipients of equal honor. The

qualifications of those called to these offices are meekness, the absence of avarice, men upright and proved (cf. 1 Tim. iii. 2–13). (9) It is to be noted that 'bishops' are mentioned, and not a single bishop; it was a plural episcopate, as well as a plural diaconate. Bishops and deacons are also mentioned together as having some close interior relationship (cf. Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii.; Clem. Rom. c. 42; Pastor, Sim. ix. 26, 27). (10) Bishops and deacons are manifestly connected with the worship of the church, the account of which in the Didache immediately precedes the mention of the organizations. (11) As in the Epistle of Clement to the Romans, there is silence as to the exact method by which bishops and deacons are appointed to their office. The congregation is told to appoint them for themselves. But the word 'appoint' (*χειροτονήσατε*) signifies a vote by the show of hands. (12) The absence of any allusion to presbyters is difficult to explain. It may be that the place they would have occupied was filled by Apostles, prophets, and teachers, who preserved the tradition and were guarantees for the order and discipline of the community. It may have been that in other churches the transition from the larger, higher ministry was mediated by presbyters, while in the churches addressed by the Didache it passed at once to the local administrative officers.

CHAPTER V

THE IGNATIAN EPISCOPATE

THE date of the Ignatian Epistles may be placed in the reign of Trajan, between the years 112 and 117 A.D. Ignatius himself is known as the Bishop of Antioch, from whence he went on his journey to Rome, condemned to the beasts, and writing his epistles on the way.[1] The atmosphere of these epistles is free from vague allusions to officials whom it is difficult to describe or identify. Teachers may be discovered in the background; they are mentioned only to be condemned. What the church needs is no longer teaching, but unity, which will be attained not by intellectual insight or spiritual sympathy, but by a closer organization. Prophets also flit dimly about in the surrounding darkness; they, too, are needed no longer; with teachers they have ministered only to freedom, to variety, or confusion, from which the church would escape. Antioch was the ancient home of the prophets, and Ignatius himself may have belonged to their company. If so, he uses his gift to dethrone prophecy and exalt the ministrations of episcopacy. There are but few references to Apostles, and no appeal is made to their authority as determining the order of the ministry. There is a seeming abruptness in the proclamation of a threefold ministry in the church,— bishops, and presbyters, and deacons,— as if it came not by regular historical descent, but by a voice from the open heavens announcing

[1] Cf. Lightfoot, *Apos. Fathers*, Pt. II., Vols. I., II.; Zahn, *Ignatius von Antiochien*, 1873; also *Patr. Ap. Oper.*, 1876, where the whole body of Ignatian literature is collected; Harnack, *Die Zeit des Ignatius*, 1878; Aubé, *His. des Persécutions de l'Église jusqu'a la fin des Antonins*, pp. 186–238; Schaff, *Ch. His.*, II., cc. iv. xiii.; Smith and Wace; and Herzog, *R. E.* Art. *Ignatius*.

that a new order had arisen and that the older order was withdrawn as no longer suited to the exigencies of the time.

The object of Ignatius in these epistles is to exalt the bishop as the head of the local church, in the place of Christ and of God. The presbyters, whose position and power in the community has hitherto seemed supreme, are now relegated to the second rank, but Ignatius is not disparaging their importance. They are mentioned with bishops and deacons as entitled to honor and obedience, an integral part of a divine order (Ad Eph. cii. and cxx.). "As the Lord did nothing without the Father, . . . so neither do ye anything without the bishop and presbyters" (Ad Mag. cc. vi., vii.). In the church at Magnesia there is "the admirable bishop, and the well-compacted spiritual crown of your presbytery and the deacons who are according to God" (c. xiii.). To the church at Tralles he writes: "It is therefore necessary that, as ye indeed do, so without the bishop ye should do nothing, but should also be subject to the presbytery as to the apostles of Jesus Christ" (Ad Trall. c. ii.). And again: "He who does anything apart from the bishop and presbytery and deacon, such a man is not pure in his conscience" (Ad Trall. vii., xiii.). To the church at Philadelphia he writes: "When I was among you I cried, I spoke with a loud voice, Give heed to the bishop and to the presbytery and deacons" (Ad Phil. c. vii., cf. c. iv.). The church at Smyrna is exhorted: "See that ye all follow the bishop, even as Jesus Christ does the Father, and the presbytery as ye would the apostles, and reverence the deacons as being the institution of God" (Ad Smyr. c. viii. and xii.). In the epistle to Polycarp: "My soul be for theirs that are submissive to the bishop, to the presbytery, and to the deacons (c. vi.).

But these passages in which Ignatius enjoins obedience to bishops, presbyters, and deacons in their collective capacity as the local ministry, are few in number and lack in impressiveness when compared with those in which the bishop alone is mentioned as entitled to the absolute obedience which belongs to God.

"Wherefore it is fitting that ye should run together in accordance with the will of your bishop, which thing also ye do. For your justly renowned presbytery, worthy of God, is fitted as exactly to the bishop as the strings are to the harp" (Ad Eph. c. iv.). "Let us be careful, then, not to set ourselves in opposition to the bishop in order that we may be subject to God" (c. v.). "It is manifest, therefore, that we should look upon the bishop even as we would upon the Lord Himself" (c. vi.). "Now it becomes you also not to treat your bishop too familiarly on account of his youth,[1] but to yield him all reverence, having respect to the power of God the Father, as I have known even holy presbyters do, not judging rashly from the manifest youthful appearance (of their bishop), but as being themselves prudent in God, submitting to him, or rather not to him, but to the Father of Jesus Christ, the bishop of us all. . . . Obey your bishop in honor of Him who has willed us to do so" (Ad Mag. cc. iii., xiii.). "Some indeed give one the title of bishop, but do all things without him" (c. iv.). "Since ye are subject to the bishop as Jesus Christ, ye appear to me to live not after the manner of men, but according to Jesus Christ who died for us" (Ad Trall., c. ii.). "It becometh every one of you, and especially the presbyters, to refresh the bishop to the honor of the Father" (c. xii.). "As many as are of God and of Jesus Christ are also with the bishop" (Ad Phil. c. iii.). "The Spirit proclaimed these words, Do nothing without the bishop" (c. vii.). "To all them that repent, the Lord grants forgiveness if they turn in penitence to the unity of God and to communion with the bishop" (c. viii.). "Let no man do anything connected with the church without the bishop. Let that be deemed a proper Eucharist which is administered either by the bishop or by one to whom he has entrusted it. Wherever the bishop shall appear, there let the multitude also be, even as wherever Jesus Christ is there is the Catholic church. It is not lawful without the bishop either to baptize or to celebrate a love-feast; but whatsoever he shall approve of, that is also pleasing to God, so that everything that is done may be secure and valid" (Ad Smyr. c. viii.). "It is well to reverence both God and

[1] In connection with this allusion to the youthful bishop, whom the aged presbyters honor, one may recall the account of the disturbance in Corinth, which was said by Clement to have been an uprising of the young against the elders or presbyters. But now the elders or presbyters are approved for submitting to the younger. If Ignatius were replying directly to Clement's epistle, it could not have been done more effectively (cf. Clem. *Ad Cor.* cc. iii., xliv.). It is also a striking characteristic of Ignatius' epistle to the Romans that nothing whatever is said about obedience to the bishop, nor is the bishop mentioned. In this respect it differs from all the other epistles. It may be that Ignatius was aware that the Roman church had not as yet the single episcopate. Renan, who rejected the other epistles as not genuine, admitted that this epistle might be attributed to Ignatius.

the bishop. He who honors the bishop has been honored by God; he who does anything without the knowledge of the bishop, serves the devil" (c. ix.). Writing to Polycarp, the Bishop of Smyrna, Ignatius enjoins him also in the familiar words, "Let nothing be done without thy consent" (c. vi.). "If any one reckons himself greater than the bishop, he is ruined. But it becomes both men and women who marry to form their union with the approval of the bishop, that their marriage may be according to God" (c. v.).

These exalted impossible claims for the bishop, in language which seems, as Bishop Lightfoot has remarked, blasphemous and profane, are better understood by considering another class of passages in the Ignatian Epistles, which have been too often overlooked as unimportant, while they actually contain the secret purport of this transcendental scheme. According to Ignatius, the bishop stands in the place of Christ and perpetuates his presence in the church. The presbyters stand in the place of the Apostles; they, and not the bishops, are the successors of the Apostles. In regard to the deacons, Ignatius is apparently ignorant that their appointment was by Apostolic authority; they are spoken of vaguely as by the constitution of God.

"Your bishop presides in the place of God, and your presbytery in the place of the assembly of the Apostles, along with your deacons, who are most dear to me" (Mag. c. vi.). "Ye are subject to the bishop as to Jesus Christ . . . ye should also be subject to the presbytery as to the Apostle of Jesus Christ" (Trall. c. ii.). "Reverence the deacons as an appointment of Jesus Christ, and the bishop as Jesus Christ, who is the Son of the Father, and the presbyters as the Sanhedrim of God and assembly of the Apostles" (Trall. c. iii.). "I flee to the Gospel as to the flesh of Jesus and to the Apostles as to the presbytery of the church" (Phil. c. v.). "See that ye all follow the bishop, even as Jesus Christ does the Father; and the presbytery as ye would the Apostles; and reverence the deacons as being the institution of God" (Smyr. c. viii.).

Although Ignatius was indifferent to the authority of tradition where the ministry was concerned (Ad Phil. cc. vii., viii.), and like St. Paul attaches the importance to the spirit rather than the letter, yet in some respects he throws light on the historical development of the ministry

not found in any other writer. In making the presbyters the successors of the Apostles, he is in harmony with the earlier documents, which represent the presbyters as standing on equal terms with the Apostles (Acts xv. 4, 6, 22, 23) in the Apostolic age, or which speak of them exclusively, as if there were no other officers in the church (James v. 14), or in which Apostles themselves claim the dignity of the presbyterate (1 Pet. v. 1). Under the presidency of James over the church in Jerusalem, those of the Apostles still living must have taken their place beneath him as presbyters, if we interpret the situation according to the later usage. As bearers of the words and traditions of Christ the presbyters rose naturally to the highest position. We need not to look to Jewish institutions to explain their origin; they came by a simple, natural, inevitable law. In virtue of their age they could render a service in the second generation of the Christian church which Apostles had rendered also to their own age. But when the bishop rose to supremacy over the presbyters, a new principle was needed to explain and justify his authority. Ignatius found this principle in his doctrine that the bishop stood for Christ Himself; and as Apostles were subject to Christ, so presbyters were subject to the bishop. This doctrine is of the very essence of the Ignatian teaching; it thrilled his imagination as he saw its deeper spiritual import; he mentions it as often as he refers to the authority of the bishop, — the bishop stands in the place of Christ and even of God.

It is further characteristic of the writings of Ignatius that the Eucharist is there presented, not only as having a deep spiritual value for the worshipper, but as having also a certain doctrinal significance in view of an heretical teaching which, in the mind of Ignatius, imperils the existence of the Christian faith. Against those who seem to him to deny the importance of the body of Christ by dwelling upon His spiritual influence or teaching, or against those who, in docetic fashion, deny that Christ has come in the flesh or has ever possessed a human body, Ignatius adduces the sacrament of the Lord's supper, as

representing to the church the presence of His body and blood. The Eucharist is also the pledge and the condition of the unity of the Christian community in Christ and in one another. The connection, therefore, of the bishop with the celebration of the Lord's supper is in the conception of Ignatius a vital relationship upon which its validity to the worshipper depends. In thus connecting the bishop with the Eucharist, Ignatius is in harmony with what Clement of Rome had asserted or with the picture in the Didache or the hints in the Shepherd of Hermas.

"Let no man deceive himself: if any one be not within the altar, he is deprived of the bread of God" (Eph. v.). "Obey the bishop and the presbytery with an undivided mind, breaking one and the same bread, which is the medicine of immortality and the antidote to prevent us from dying that we should live forever in Jesus Christ" (Eph. xx.). "Take ye heed then to have but one Eucharist. For there is one flesh, your Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup into the unity of His blood; one altar; as there is one bishop, along with the presbytery and deacons" (Phil. iv.). "They (the heretics) abstain from the Eucharist and from prayer because they confess not the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ" (Smyr. vii.). "Let that be deemed a proper Eucharist which is ministered either by the bishop or by one to whom he has entrusted it. . . . It is not lawful without the bishop either to baptize or to celebrate a love-feast" (Smyr. viii.).

But we come still nearer the solution of the problem, the monarchical supremacy of the bishop as Ignatius enforced it, if we take into consideration the personality of Ignatius himself. The character of the man shines through his writings, an intense spirit consumed with zeal, a visionary, an enthusiast, a transcendentalist, to whom the fact is as nothing in the light of the idea; and yet, withal, a man aiming at practical ends, letting himself down from the clouds in order to walk more firmly upon the earth. He says nothing of tradition or of Apostolic authority; he is indifferent to the testimony of the ancients. But he is aware that he is innovating, that what he proposes is open to criticism, that it may be thought he is adjusting some compromise, in order to

harmonize differences in the church.[1] He seems to be conscious that the tradition of the church is against him, but he substitutes Christ in place of the tradition of the elders: "When I heard some saying, If I do not find it in the archives I will not believe the Gospel; on my saying to them, It is written, they answered me, That remains to be proved. But to me Jesus Christ is in the place of the archives or charters. His cross and death and resurrection and the faith which is by Him are undefiled monuments of antiquity; by which I desire through your prayers to be justified" (Phil. viii.).[2]

In urging upon the churches the monarchical episcopate, Ignatius disclaims for himself any Apostolic authority. He deprecates the possibility that he may be regarded as some great person issuing his orders to the churches (Eph. iii.). He has not reached such a height of self-esteem that he issues commands as if he were an Apostle (Trall. iii.). When writing to the Romans, he exclaims, "I do not as Peter and Paul issue commandments unto you." Whence then comes the authority with which he speaks? The only answer is that he speaks through the Spirit as possessing the gift of prophecy. There are two passages in which he claims for himself the direct insight into spiritual things which were characteristic of the prophet: "*I have great knowledge in God*, but I restrain myself lest I should perish through boasting. For now it is needful for me to be the more fearful and not give heed to those that puff me up. For they that speak to me in the way of commendation scourge me" (Trall. iv.). And again, "Am I not able to write to you of heavenly things? But I fear to do so lest I should inflict injury on you who are but children" (Trall. v.).

It was then as a prophet that Ignatius was speaking to

[1] The contrast here between Clement of Rome and Ignatius is very striking. Clement supposed that the Apostles, knowing that there would be strife over the office of the episcopate, took steps in advance for its prevention (c. xlii.). But according to Ignatius, the elevation of the bishop was announced as a principle or abstract truth, without any foreknowledge of dissensions.

[2] Cf. Lightfoot, *Apos. Fathers*, Part II., Vol. II., pp. 271, 272.

the churches, and the burden of his message, "Do nothing without the bishop," was derived not from tradition, nor was it suggested by the exigencies of the hour, but it was imparted to him by the Holy Spirit. Such is the claim made in the following remarkable passage:

"For though some would have deceived me according to the flesh, yet the Spirit, as being from God, is not deceived. For it knows both whence it comes and whither it goes, and detects the secrets. For when I was among you I cried, I spoke with a loud voice: Give heed to the bishop and to the presbytery and deacons. Now some suspected me of having spoken thus, as knowing beforehand the division caused by some among you. But He is my witness for whose sake I am in bonds, that I got no intelligence from any man. But the Spirit proclaimed these words: *Do nothing without the bishop*" (Phil. vii.).[1]

The above passages indicate that Ignatius claimed for himself a direct revelation from God such as Christian prophets claimed as the warrant of their teaching. It was the Holy Ghost who was speaking; Ignatius was but the mouthpiece of the Spirit's utterance, "Do nothing without the bishop." But in strange and inexplicable contrast with these claims which Ignatius makes for himself, — intimations at least that he knew the deep things of God and could discourse concerning them if he chose, — is the silence which he maintains in regard to the order of Christian prophets. He does not mention them, or appear to be aware of their existence. His home was in Antioch, where there were in Apostolic days prophets and teachers. From thence Paul and Barnabas had been sent forth with Apostolic authority by the commission of the prophets. St. Paul had declared that prophets were an order in the church by the divine will and appointment. In Ignatius'

[1] It is a mark of the difference between the age of Ignatius and the fourth century, when the longer Greek recension of his epistles was written, that the later writer tones down these assertions of Ignatius in which he claims the gift of prophecy. The expression, "I have great knowledge in God," is omitted altogether; and the other expression, "Am I not able to write to you of heavenly things?" becomes "Might I not write to you things more full of mystery?" In the later period the qualifications of a prophet were no longer understood, as the office itself had long been forgotten.

own time there were prophets in the church at Rome, as is witnessed by Hermas, or in the communities addressed by the Didache. But not only is he silent as to the very existence of the prophets, but whenever he uses the word 'prophet,' he applies it to Old Testament seers who had foreseen the advent of Christ or lived in expectation of His coming. He was one of the first, if not actually the first, to reverse the Christian order which places prophets after Apostles, and to substitute another formula, — prophets and Apostles, — as if the Christian prophet were no longer to be associated with Apostles as the foundation on which the church had been built, or were no longer entitled to honorable mention. In the silence of Ignatius there is tacit condemnation. The order of the prophets is growing weak. Ignatius represents prophecy as signing the warrant for its own dissolution. He used his prophetic gift to announce the coming of another régime, the Catholic order, in which formal prophecy would be done away.[1]

But there are intimations in the writings of Ignatius that, despite his silence regarding the prophets as an order in the Christian ministry, he is aware of its existence, and has his own estimate of its work. When St. Paul was writing to the Corinthians he complains of their spiritual incapacity: "And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ. I have fed you with milk and not with meat, for hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able" (1 Cor. iii. 1, 2). Ignatius employs the same metaphor in writing to the Trallians. He is able to write to them of heavenly things, but he fears to do so, lest he should be giving them the strong meat of the Word, which might hurt them as babes in Christ (Trall. v.). But he does not complain of their childish state, or condemn it with St. Paul as carnal; he approves of it, as if it

[1] Cf. Epis. ad Mag. ix.; ad Phil. v., ix., with St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, ii. 20; Die Instanz, "Propheten und Apostel," löste nun die alte Instanz, "Apostel, Propheten und Lehrer ab." Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, I. 336.

were the normal order. What St. Paul regarded as exceptional, and deprecated as such, Ignatius makes the rule and the basis of Christian society. The strong meat is withdrawn for other reasons: Ignatius fears for himself lest he should be puffed up with pride, if he spoke too freely from his great knowledge in God (Trall. iv.); but he has also a deeper source of distrust and dread, lest he should appear to sanction the teaching of some who are mingling poison with the food of the Gospel (Trall. vi.). And yet, so far as he is able, he clothes the incoming order with what is left of the prophet's authority. His conception of the episcopate was a transcendental vision such as only a prophet could conceive. He takes it for granted that bishop, presbyters, and deacons are so filled with the life of the Spirit, that when the bishop acts or speaks, he does so in the name of Christ, and all alike recognize his deed or utterance as divine.

The difficulties in the writings of Ignatius are greatly simplified, when it is borne in mind that the episcopate to which he urges obedience is a local office, the pastorate of a parish and not an ecclesiastical administration for the church upon a larger scale, as the later episcopate became. The Ignatian bishop is in every essential respect the minister of the local congregation, and the presbyters are his assistant ministers or curates.[1] This view, which is too often obscured in the discussion, gives a certain rationality to the purpose of Ignatius, explaining his devotion and zeal in its advocacy. In the interest of unity, the time, it seemed to him, had come when the supremacy in the congregation should be vested in one individual man. His scheme may have defects in its details, it may be one-

[1] "The bishop of primitive times was not by any means the potentate we are apt to think him. There were at first very few Christians in the country, and these few would come into the towns to worship. Every town of any size had its bishop; and if there were several churches they were served by the clergy whom the bishop kept about him; they were, in fact, like our present 'chapels of ease,' and the whole position of the bishop was very similar to that of the incumbent of the parish church in one of our smaller towns" (Professor W. Sanday, in *Expositor*, V., 1887, p. 113; cf. also, Cheetham, *Ch. His.*, p. 128).

sided and not take sufficient account of actual difficulties; it may be too much in the air, as Ignatius conceived it. But if it could have been realized, it was not without adaptation to the new age that was coming in, and to the emergency which was confronting the churches. A time of intellectual activity, and consequent confusion, was at hand in which the simplicity of the Gospel was threatened. It may well be that Ignatius exaggerated the evils, as a method of enforcing his argument for the necessity of what seems too often, in his writings, a blind submission and obedience. But after all these qualifications, the total picture in the mind of Ignatius has its beauty, its power, its pathos. It is a plea for unity by a great soul, a rare personality, a man also on his way to death, which changes the perspective of human things. In this spirit we may listen to him as he calls himself a man devoted to unity. "Nothing is more precious than peace, by which all war both in heaven and earth is brought to an end." "Let us do all things as those who have Christ dwelling in us, that we may be His temples and that He may be in us as our God, which indeed He is, and will manifest Himself before our faces." "Have a regard to preserve unity," he writes to Polycarp, "than which nothing is better. . . . The times call for thee as pilots do for the winds, and as one tossed with the tempest seeks for the haven."

CHAPTER VI

THEORIES REGARDING THE ORIGIN OF THE EPISCOPATE

In the preceding chapter the evidence of ancient documents bearing upon the early organization of the church has been brought together with no attempt to urge any one theory by which the many allusions they contain may be harmonized as features of one consistent and uniform system of ecclesiastical government. There are several theories deduced from this mass of evidence, of which some brief account may now be given.

I

In the first place, there is the inference that the government of the churches varied in different places, and at different times in the same place, and that there was no one uniform type which is common to all. In the church at Jerusalem the Twelve seem to be supreme in the earliest years, with a superintendence over the other Christian communities in Palestine and Syria. Then they are associated with presbyters or elders under the presidency of James, the Lord's brother. In the church at Ephesus there were at one time Apostles, prophets, and evangelists, with pastors and teachers, and at another moment this church is represented, as in the Pastoral Epistles, as under the superintendence of the Evangelist, Timothy, with presbyters, bishops, and deacons. The church at Philippi had bishops and deacons, while the churches addressed by Peter and James and John appear to have had presbyters only. At Antioch, in the earliest years, there were prophets and teachers who took the lead, while in the Antioch of Igna-

tius there is no mention of them, but the bishop, the presbyters, and deacons have taken their place. In the church at Rome, when Clement wrote, there were rulers and presbyters, bishops and deacons, but in the same church, when Hermas wrote, the prophets still maintained a position of influence and authority. In the church at Corinth, as at Rome, there were presbyters, and, as also at Rome, there was a plural episcopate. But not far from this time, in the churches of Asia Minor to which Ignatius wrote, there was but one bishop. In Rome and at Corinth the presbyters do not appear as subordinate to the bishops, while according to Ignatius the bishop is supreme. In the churches to which the Didache was addressed, there were Apostles, prophets, and deacons, and there were also bishops and deacons, but presbyters are not mentioned, and there was no single bishop who was chief over the communities.

The inference that officers do not exist in any particular church because they are not mentioned must, however, be drawn with great caution. It is quite possible, for example, that there may have been those answering to presbyters, in the church at Philippi, where only bishops and deacons are mentioned; as also that there may have been bishops and deacons in communities where only presbyters are mentioned. Again, the view which sees only variety and difference in the organization of the local churches, neglects certain common tendencies and resemblances, which are vitally related to the development of the ministry. Important theological issues, on which depended the well-being if not the existence of a common Christendom, are involved in the external ecclesiastical form which the spirit of the church was assuming. It may be true that it is not yet possible to give a complete symmetrical picture of the whole situation, as it existed at any moment; but this should not be so construed as to warrant the inference that no common principle was at stake, no common motive which gave homogeneousness amid great divergencies.

II

The position of James, the Lord's brother, in the church of Jerusalem has been regarded as the origin and sanction of what is known as episcopacy in the later and technical use of the word. That James occupied some such position must be admitted. In his office of presidency he was surrounded by Apostles and presbyters as if an advisory council, but the narrative gives the impression that the responsibility of a higher authority rested upon him. When Peter was set free from imprisonment he requested that his liberation should be made known to James (Acts xii. 17). It was James who presided in the conference at Jerusalem, who summed up in his speech the points made by previous speakers, and then gave the sentence which the Apostles and brethren adopted (Acts xv. 13, 19). When Paul made his last visit to Jerusalem, he went in unto James, and all the elders were present (Acts xxi. 18; cf. Gal. i. 19, ii. 12). The tradition also of the second century assigns to James at least the headship of the church in Jerusalem, if not a more extensive authority.

But there are circumstances connected with the position of James which give to it a peculiar and somewhat exceptional character, so that it can hardly be claimed as a precedent for later ages, without great qualifications. Passing over the fact that he is not called bishop in the New Testament, it must be noticed as an unusual circumstance that no account should be given of the time and circumstances of his elevation to his high place.[1] It would be naturally supposed that one of the Twelve would have been called to this position. It seems strange that James should not have been elected in the place of Matthias, when the Twelve were filling up their number. There are gaps in the narrative of the Acts of the Apostles, but this is a point

[1] Cf. Euseb., *H. E.*, ii. 1 for the tradition in the sixth book of Clement's *Hypotyposeis*, where it is said that "Peter, James, and John, after the ascension of our Saviour, though they had been preferred by our Lord, did not contend for the honor, but chose James the Just as Bishop of Jerusalem."

in regard to which silence is very difficult to explain. The only explanation which seems to suit all the requirements of the case is that James took the precedence in virtue of his blood relationship to Christ. He was the Lord's brother. As such he was known in the ancient church. There have been efforts to show that he may have been one of the Twelve; but in the early church it was his blood relationship which seems to have been regarded as his highest claim to distinction. In the Greek Euchology he is distinguished from James the brother of John and from James the son of Alphæus, and is designated as James, the Apostle, the brother of God.[1] He was succeeded in his position as governor of the church in Jerusalem by Simeon, who was also a blood relation of Christ.[2] It is possible that among the tentative visions of the early church this was one, that there should be a visible headship over all the Christian communities, which should be continued in the line of relatives of Christ after the flesh, and whose centre should be the sacred city of Jerusalem. But if so, the fall of Jerusalem in the year 70, and its further humiliation and abandonment under Hadrian, made the dream impossible. The subject, however, is obscure, and is further complicated by romance mixed with uncertain tradition, to which one does not know how much historical significance to ascribe.[3]

[1] Among many discussions of this intricate point, cf. Lightfoot, *Epistle to the Galatians*, on the Brethren of the Lord, pp. 89–127.

[2] Cf. Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 11. "After the martyrdom of James and the capture of Jerusalem which immediately followed, the report is, that those of the Apostles and the disciples of our Lord that were yet surviving, came together from all parts, with those that were related to our Lord according to the flesh. For the greater part of them were yet living. These consulted together, to determine whom it was proper to pronounce worthy of being the successor of James. They all unanimously declared Simeon, the son of Cleophas, of whom mention is made in the sacred volume, as worthy of the episcopal seat there. They say he was the cousin-german of our Saviour, for Hegesippus asserts that Cleophas was the brother of Joseph." Cf. also iii. 20, where it is said that Domitian was alarmed about the relatives of our Lord, as if they aspired to found a temporal kingdom. This report also came from Hegesippus. In this connection see Matt. xii. 47, Mark iii. 32, Luke viii. 20; also Matt. xx. 20–28.

[3] Cf. the pseudo-Clementine writings, which contain several allusions to James as the head of the whole church; *Epis. Pet*, whose superscrip-

The Ignatian episcopate differs from the rule or ascendency ascribed to James, in being a local office whose authority is confined within the community. But not only does the tradition of the second century give to James an universal authority; there are also hints in the New Testament that his superintendence included Antioch and the Gentile as well as the Jewish Christians; that even the Twelve, including also Peter and Paul, treated him with a certain deference as the head of the church. It is quite remarkable that Ignatius is silent regarding any Apostolic precedent for the local bishop whose authority he is advocating. He must have known, living as he did at Antioch, something of the history of the church in Jerusalem, but he urges the independence of the local bishop, as if he had never heard of any higher authority resident in the sacred city. It may even be that he is combating in his own way the possibility of an interference from without with the supremacy of the local episcopate. It was also the Ignatian type of episcopate and not that of Jerusalem, which spread in Asia Minor, in Italy, and in North Africa. But notwithstanding this wide divergence in type, there is a certain affinity between them in that the claim is made for both that they represent Christ: James by virtue of his blood relationship to Christ after the flesh, the Ignatian bishop through his relationship to the Eucharist which is a sacrament of His body and blood. And as the former stood above Apostles, even the Twelve, so the latter is elevated above presbyters, who stand in the place of Apostles. Both types of episcopate differ from that which finally prevailed, which made the bishops the successors of the Apostles.[1]

tion runs, "James, the lord and bishop of the Holy Church"; also *Epis. Clem. ad Jacob.*: "James, the Lord and the Bishop of bishops, who rules Jerusalem, the holy church of the Hebrews, and the churches everywhere excellently founded by the providence of God." See also *Rec.* i. 68, 73; iv. 35. It is all romance, but may have had its influence upon Rome.

[1] There was in the church at Alexandria a peculiar kind of episcopate, having affinities with that of James, to which allusion will be made hereafter. For a discussion of the position of James and of the Ignatian bishop, cf. Ritschl, *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*, pp. 415 ff.

III

The view that the episcopate arose by the localization of the Apostles finds its strongest advocacy in the Roman church. There is a tradition that Peter lived at Rome as its bishop and appointed his successor. This tradition may have been combated by Protestant scholars since the Reformation, on dogmatic grounds. But as a result of the long controversy, it must now be admitted that the Roman claim is inadmissible, founded on a tradition mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome, that Peter went to Rome about the year 42 and remained there till his death by martyrdom in 64. According to the chronology which is generally adopted, he could not have gone there before the year 61, which was the date of Paul's arrival.[1] That Peter visited Rome is a residuum out of a large tradition, which may be retained, as also that he died there as a martyr. But the visit of an Apostle does not constitute his localization or settlement as a bishop. It is rather in harmony with the view that the calling of an Apostle forbade his permanent residence in any city. There is another tradition that St. John in his later years was established at Ephesus, but in this case also he did not reside there as its bishop; for, according to a tradition, which is valid, Timothy went there as an evangelist or delegate of St. Paul, to whom was intrusted the superintendency of its church. In the case of the others of the Twelve nothing is known; the traditions which assign to them various localities are late and have no historical value.

The theory of the localization of the Apostles introduces confusion rather than clearness. It is opposed to the con-

[1] Cf. Farrar, F. W., *Early Days of Christianity*, Appendix, 1, 2, 3; Renan, *L'Antichrist*, Appendix; Schaff, *Ch. His.*, I., c. 4; Schmid, J., *Petrus in Rom;* Herzog, *R. E.* Art. *Petrus*. In the proposed redating of the incidents in the later life of Paul, the time of his going to Rome is placed by Dr. McGiffert so early as 56 A.D., and his martyrdom in the year 58, which may also be the year of Peter's visit to Rome, thus allowing a residence at Rome by Peter of some five or six years. Cf. Article, *Peter's Sojourn in Rome*, in *American Journal of Theology*, Jan., 1897; also, by same author, *The Apostolic Church* in *Inter. Theol. Lib.*

ception of the Apostolate given in the New Testament, that the Apostle was a missionary moving from place to place. In the Didache, while provision is made for settling prophets and teachers in some local church, no such contingency is contemplated for an Apostle. And again, if we admit the theory for the sake of discussion, it is discredited by well-known facts regarding the episcopate, such as the different types of bishops presented in the second century, the local or parish episcopate in Asia Minor, or the one bishop at Alexandria with his twelve presbyters and his superintendency over all Egypt. Rome also, from a very early period, may have had a conception of the episcopate different from either of these, which is suggested in the pseudo-Clementine writings and illustrated in a certain consciousness of authority even in the time of Irenæus.

The silence of the Ignatian Epistles regarding the residence of St. John in Asia Minor or his activity in superintending the churches, is a difficulty hard to overcome. If Ignatius had appealed to the authority of the beloved disciple, by whom the bishops were appointed there, it seems as if it must have carried greater weight with those to whom he wrote than his appeal to a prophetic revelation. But be this as it may, the tradition existed at the close of the second century that St. John had been the agent for the introduction of the local or parish episcopate into the churches of Asia Minor. Tertullian wrote, "The order of the bishops, when traced back to its origin, will be found to rest upon John as its author."[1] And Clement of Alexandria, writing about the same time, says that the Apostle John, "when he returned to Ephesus from the isle of Patmos, went away, being invited to the adjacent territories of the nations, here to appoint bishops, there to set in order whole churches, there to ordain such as were marked out by the Spirit."[2] But the office of a bishop differs so fundamentally from that of an Apostle, that, as Bishop Lightfoot has

[1] Adv. Marc. iv. 5. [2] Quis. Div. Salv. c. xlii.

remarked, "It is not to the Apostle that we must look for the prototype of the bishop."[1]

IV

The theory, which is identified with the name of St. Jerome, that 'presbyter' and 'bishop' are used in the New Testament as synonymous, and that the name 'bishop' was afterwards used to designate the higher officer to whom the presbyters were subordinate, has been maintained with great force by Bishop Lightfoot. In the words of the latter, "The episcopate was formed not out of the Apostolic order by localization, but out of the presbyteral by elevation; and the title, which originally was common to all, came at length to be appropriated to the chief among them."[2] The objection to this theory is that it throws no light on the difficulties which are encountered in the effort to trace the origin of the Christian ministry; while it raises even greater difficulties by making the transition inexplicable in the writings of Ignatius, where bishops and presbyters are sharply distinguished. It

[1] *Essay on Christian Ministry*, p. 196.

[2] According to Bishop Lightfoot, the terms 'presbyter' and 'bishop' are used interchangeably in Acts xx. 17, 28, and again in 1 Peter v. 1, 2. In the First Epistle to Timothy (iii. 1–7) the qualifications of a bishop are meant to apply also to presbyters (v. 17). When St. Paul salutes the bishops and deacons (Phil. i. 1), by bishops must be understood presbyters, since it is incredible that they should be passed over. Further evidence of the identification of name and office is found in Clement (Cor. cc. xliii., xliv.) and in the Epistle of Polycarp. The phraseology which distinguished between bishops and presbyters began to come into vogue in the early years of the second century, but so late as the time of Irenæus the older usage had not entirely disappeared. Cf. Iren. Adv. Haer. iii. 2. 2, and iii. 3. 1, 2, and 14. 1, 2, where successions of presbyters are mentioned as preserving the traditions, and again successions of bishops. Bishop Lightfoot also appealed to Jerome's testimony (Epis. lxix., cxlvi.) that "among the ancients bishops and presbyters are the same." Cf. Lightfoot, *Com. on Phil.*, pp. 97, 98. Cf. also *Essay*, etc., p. 196. Jerome's theory, it should be said, was drawn from his study of the New Testament rather than from any special knowledge of an age following the Apostles, when the change was made by which the bishops rose above the presbyter. But there was also in Jerome's mind a dogmatic purpose which was supported by his theory and to which allusion will be made hereafter.

overlooks the possibility of distinctions which would explain the apparent identity of name and office; for it may have been that presbyters exercised one kind of superintendence or episcopacy, and bishops another and different kind. It is possible that the bishops may have been presbyters, while all presbyters were not bishops.

The grounds on which this ancient theory has been questioned and finally rejected by later scholars are as follows. In the first place, it has been noticed that bishops and deacons are mentioned together in the same connection, and that when they are thus mentioned presbyters are not mentioned. And conversely, where presbyters are mentioned, they stand by themselves, and there is no connected allusion to bishops and deacons. Thus in the Epistles to the Philippians, St. Paul salutes the bishops and deacons, but is silent regarding presbyters. In the First Epistle to Timothy and in the Epistle to Titus, the qualifications of bishops and deacons are given together, as if these offices were related, but when presbyters are mentioned in these epistles, it is by themselves and in another connection. Clement of Rome says that the Apostles "appointed the firstfruits of their labors to be bishops and deacons" (Cor. c. xlii.), but when he speaks of presbyters, he is speaking upon a different subject and associates them with the rulers (cc. ii., iii.). According to the Didache, the local community is told to appoint bishops and deacons, but no allusion is made to presbyters. A similar connection is seen in the Shepherd of Hermas, where in one paragraph the deacons are mentioned and in the next the bishops, as though they were bound together by some special tie (Sim. ix. 26, 27). There are some apparent exceptions to this rule, but it remains to be proved that they are exceptions.[1]

In the second place, the reason for associating bishops and deacons is that in some special way they were con-

[1] Cf. Weizsäcker, V. 3, § i. In the Epistle of Polycarp presbyters and deacons are mentioned, but not bishops. But it is possible that, as Dr. Harnack has suggested, in small communities those who were recognized as the presbyters would be one and the same with the bishops. Cf. *Expositor*, V., 1887, p. 338.

nected with the Lord's supper, which at first took the shape of the *agape*, or the common meal, where an offering was made which was intrusted to the bishop, and in the distribution of which to the poor the deacons were his assistants. In the celebration of the Eucharist, as described by Justin Martyr, the bishop presides and the deacons distribute the elements or carry them to the absent (Apol. c. lxv.). This usage, which prevailed at Rome in the middle of the second century, is in harmony with the allusion of Clement of Rome, where he connects the appointment of bishops and deacons with an offering to be presented and a service to be performed (*προσφορὰς καὶ λειτουργίας*). The Didache plainly intimates that bishops and deacons are to be ordained in order to take the place of the prophet as ministrants in the Eucharist. St. Paul, then, it may be inferred, salutes the bishops and deacons, because he is writing to acknowledge a gift of money, or an offering which had been made to him by the church at Philippi (Phil. iv. 15–19). That the bishop was the responsible financial officer of the community has received abundant proof.[1] Not only does he thus appear in these early documents, but he retained this character at a later time and through the Middle Ages. He had the care of ministering to the poor, the widows and orphans, and in fulfilling his charge was aided by the deacons. Ecclesiastical tradition has retained this feature of the diaconate to our own day. Hence the qualifications for a bishop, as well as for deacons, are those of a good administrative officer, possessing an honest report, free from covetousness and from the love of money.

But the bishop was not only the responsible financial head of the community, at a time when this department of Christian activity was foremost in importance, as Dr.

[1] The language of Justin Martyr on this point is conclusive. After describing the method of keeping the Eucharist, he remarks: "They who are well to do and willing give what each thinks fit; and what is collected is deposited with the president (the bishop), who succors the orphans and widows and those who through sickness or any other cause are in want, . . . and in a word takes care of all who are in need" (*Apol.* lxvii.). Cf. Her. Sim. ix. 26, 27.

Hatch has shown,[1] but he also had charge of the worship of the church, and especially did he preside at the celebration of the Lord's supper. These two functions of oversight combining in the bishop gave him from an early moment great prominence. They were functions closely affiliated; for the offering of money or alms was made at the moment when the service or worship of the Eucharist was to be rendered. Of the two functions, the presidency at the memorial feast had most to do with the elevation of the bishop above the presbyter. In the earliest administration of the Eucharist, while it was still an *agape* or evening meal,[2] the congregation sat down at the table and one presided. Thus was furnished a living picture and a perpetual memory of Christ's last supper with his disciples. But when the congregation became too large to sit down at the common table, the picture was changed, yet so as to remain a picture still; but a dramatization also in place of the reality. A few were chosen to sit with the bishop at the table, upon whom also the deacons waited, and these chosen guests were the presbyters.[3]

[1] *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches, Bampton Lectures*, 1880; Lecture ii., on Bishops and Deacons. Cf. Uhlhorn, *Christian Charity in the Ancient Church* (Eng. Trans.), N. Y., 1883.

[2] The love-feast or *agape* was still the form of the Eucharist in the time of Ignatius (Smyr. viii.).

"The Christian festival, both in the hour of the day and in the arrangement of the meal, was substantially a reproduction of Christ's last night with His disciples. Hence, it was called 'the Lord's supper,' —a name originally applied to the combined Eucharist and *agape*, but afterward applied to the former when the latter had been separated or abolished" (Lightfoot, *Apos. Fathers*, Part II., Vol. I., p. 400).

[3] Cf. Gebhardt u. Harnack, *Texte u. Untersuchungen*, Vol. II. 5, p. 11, for the second of the so-called Apostolic Ordinances, in which the presbyters are represented as surrounding the bishop in the ministration of the Eucharist. For an exposition of the influence of the Eucharist upon ecclesiastical organization, cf. Sohm, *Kirchenrecht*, Bd. I. (1892), §§ 9, 11: "Die wesentliche Aufgabe dieses Bischofsamtes war die Verwaltung der Eucharistie und, in Zusammenhang damit, die Verwaltung der Opfergaben" (des Kirchenguts) (p. 84). "Die Diakonen stehen im eucharistischen Gottesdienst als die bereiten Gehülfen des Bischofs, der Bischof sitzt. Aber der Bischof kann nicht allein am Abendmahlstische sitzen. Wie mit dem Herrn Christus die Apostel, seine Jünger, so muss mit dem Bischof seine Gemeinde zu Tische (am Altar) sitzen, aber die Gemeinde ist gros geworden. Die ganze Versammlung findet am Abendmahlstische

In this way was presented to the imagination the last supper, when Christ presided and the Apostles sat on either side. This was the second stage in the modification of the Lord's supper. The table became a symbol, and bishop and presbyters fulfilled a symbolic function, the bishop representing Christ, and the presbyters His Apostles. For a long time this symbolism endured, until the sacrificial principle became dominant, when the table was withdrawn into the sanctuary as in the Greek church, and shut out from the public gaze; or, as in the Latin church, the table was transformed into an altar, and bishop and presbyters became a sacrificing priesthood. But the ancient usage still survives in ritual practices, which go back to the days when the bishop sat at table and was aided in the ministrations of the table by the deacons. In the Roman church, the Pope alone still retains the sitting posture behind the altar, when he receives the bread and wine.[1] If the presbyter officiates, he does so in the place of the bishop, and those who aid him are designated deacons for the time being, whatever may be their ecclesiastical rank.

We have here the possible clew to what has remained so long obscure and enigmatical. It may have been for this reason that James was chosen to preside over the Apostles in Jerusalem, and thus fulfil, as the Lord's brother, the injunction to keep the feast in memory of Christ. It may have been for this reason that in Alexandria there was one bishop with twelve presbyters, down

keinen Platz mehr. Daher die Frage: wer sitzt mit dem Bischof am Altar? . . . Die Antwort auf die gestellte Frage lautet: . . . die geistlichen Ehrenpersonen der Gemeinde, also, Asketen, Märtyrer, Lehrbegabte, vor allem und für die Regel, (denn jene Erstgenannten sind nicht in jeder Versammlung zu finden), die Ältesten" (p. 138). See also *Apos. Cons.* viii. 12.

[1] Cf. a very interesting note in Stanley, *Christian Institutions*, on the Pope's posture at the Communion, pp. 206 ff. Luther was greatly disgusted when he learned that the Pope did not kneel with his fellow-sinners, misinterpreting it as an evidence of papal arrogance. As a precious relic of early usage it illustrates the dignity and conservatism of the papal office, and bears witness to the consciousness within the church of the time when the change was made from sitting to kneeling.

to the middle of the third century. This may have been the image in the mind of Ignatius, as he presents the bishop in the place of Christ, and the presbyters in the place of the Apostles. It was because the Lord's supper was not only growing in the reverence of the people, but was gaining a dogmatic significance also throughout the second century, that the bishop's position as president at the supper gave him the ascendency, in the Christian imagination and in the heathen estimate, over the presbyter. For in the meantime, also, the function of the presbyter was changing. The time was already coming when his testimony to the traditions of the fathers would no longer be necessary, when, indeed, it would be impossible for him to render it. Testimony of this kind at second hand may be valuable, but in the third or fourth degree it begins to diminish in value. The presbyter as a link with the past, as vouching for the *ipsissima verba* of Christ and His Apostles, was giving way to the Rule of Faith and the Canon of the New Testament. The other functions of the presbyters had been teaching or exhortation, combined with moral discipline and the watch over the young. If the bishop was selected from the ranks of the presbyters, as it is necessary to suppose must have been the case, then the seeming identity of the names of bishop and presbyter is shown to have been in appearance only. At the time when presbyters held the highest place, it would be the highest title of honor belonging to the bishop that he belonged to the presbyterate, and as such he would be mentioned. When we consider that the bishop was the financial administrative head of the community, that he also had the superintendence of worship, that he had the supervision of the deacons also, and that the poor, the widows, and the orphans looked to him for protection, that in addition to these functions he also possessed the dignity of a presbyter, it is not difficult to explain the transition to which Ignatius bears witness. The step was inevitable by which he rose to supremacy. The wonder is not that the change came so soon, but that it had not come earlier. The appearance of the Ignatian bishop

was only retarded by the intensely democratic character of early Christianity.

In concluding this sketch of the history of the Christian ministry according to the documents produced in the first three Christian generations, it must be said again that the picture is not complete, nor is the material sufficient to make it complete. The government of the churches may have varied in different places and at different times in the same place. In some communities Apostles and prophets lingered longer than in others, and the local ministry followed a slower development. In a general way it may be said that the presbyters were more prominent in Jewish Christian churches, and the bishops in Gentile Christian churches, just as the term 'presbyter' had its analogy in the Jewish synagogue, while the term 'bishop' is of heathen origin, and had its counterpart in heathen organizations. But not much is gained by dwelling on this distinction. The Christian presbyter differed from the Jewish presbyter, and it is just that difference which it is important to seize. The Christian bishop bears but a faint resemblance to the presiding officer of Greek fraternities. But though the picture may not be complete in its details, yet the general outline is clear. The ministry of the Apostolic age came by divine appointment, and was divided into two ranks. In the highest rank was the ministry which was devoted to the preaching of the Word, and in whose ministrations the whole body of the Christian communities shared; God hath appointed first, Apostles; secondly, prophets; thirdly, teachers. In the second rank came the local ministry, occupied primarily with administrative duties. The names of the officers of the local ministry were for a time unfixed or general in their character, but even from an early moment three titles appear which were destined to be permanent, — presbyters and bishops and deacons. These titles, bishop and presbyter, stood from the first for distinct functions, and while they may seem to be used interchangeably, the distinction always existed beneath the apparent identity. The presbyter might perform the functions of the bishop,

when appointed thereto; or the bishop, while still a bishop, might have duties as a presbyter, since, as a rule, he must have been chosen from the board of the presbyters. Moral instruction and guidance of the young were the function of the presbyter; superintendence of the worship, the care of the funds, and the responsibility for the poor were the sphere of the bishop, in which he was assisted by the deacons.

But divine order and appointment is subject to change and to modification by the exigencies of time and of all human affairs. The more divine the order, the deeper is the spirit of life which it enshrines; and life is revealed in change and progress, while immobility is death. The development of the ministry after the Apostolic age lay in the appropriation, as far as it was possible, of the functions of the higher ministry of Apostles, prophets, and teachers by the officers of the local church. In what way, and to what extent, presbyters and bishops fulfilled these duties, must be traced in the later history. Even though the Apostolic office, the prophetic function, and the gift of teaching could not be transferred in mechanical fashion, and suffered by diminution and loss in the transition to the ministry of the Catholic church, yet the change or development was no less divinely ordered. The church was to find a great and effectual opening in the Roman Empire, and its highest duty was to adapt itself to the new conditions of its existence. The first step was taken to this end, when the bishop was placed above the presbyter, when administration of ecclesiastical affairs became the highest function and was honored with the highest rank in the ministry. Ignatius recognized from afar the coming change, and became the forerunner in its accomplishment. How the Ignatian episcopate developed into the Catholic episcopate becomes the next subject of inquiry.

CHAPTER VII

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY IN THE SECOND CENTURY

I

At the beginning of the second century the bishop had been presented in the Epistles of Ignatius as the successor of Christ. When the century closed, the bishop had become known as the successor of the Apostles. In this change is summed up as in an epitome the modification which the intervening years had wrought in the ecclesiastical structure of the early church. As there is here disclosed an important difference in the way of regarding the bishop, so also no less significant a transformation has been wrought in the status of the presbyter. When the presbyter lost his place and dignity as the successor and representative of Apostles, the original function of his office or rank had also disappeared, and the way was open for his development in some other direction. In his original capacity the presbyter had been one of a board or council, of which also the bishop must be supposed to have been a member, whose function was a moral oversight and discipline coupled with the responsibility for the preservation of the Christian tradition. Traces of this early arrangement continued to survive in obscure ways, but no longer understood, some of which have come down to our own day. But the office was changing its character in the second century, although the name and title were still retained. The presbyterate is henceforth a new office, to be studied in its new rôle as it entered upon its development. The responsibility of vouching for the tradition was transferred to the episcopate, a prerogative for which the qualification of age was no longer required. Or, in other words, the presbyter, in the Ignatian scheme, was to be subject to the

bishop, because the bishop stood in the place of Christ. In the later adjustment, the presbyter is subject to the bishop, because the bishop stands in the place of an Apostle.

The explanation of the change is to be sought in the peculiar circumstances of the second century, which left their deep impression on the church. The confusion and distraction of the age gave birth to one supreme controlling issue — the necessity of finding some basis for the authority of Christian teaching, some ground of Christian certitude. To the average mind, the foundation of the faith seemed to be shaken by the importation of new and strange teaching, as by the Gnostic thinkers, who sought the intellectual solution of problems which were raised by the contemplation of Christ as a world teacher and redeemer. The foundations of ecclesiastical order also seemed to be weakened by the efforts of Montanist prophets, who were aiming at a moral reformation of the church. In the resistance to these two disintegrating tendencies, as they appeared, the episcopate changed its form.

Ignatius had not been greatly concerned for the preservation of Christian faith in its purity and vitality, so long as the bishop could be regarded as the representative of Christ in every local community; for then Christ Himself would, as it were, be speaking in every Christian assembly, and His word would carry still its ancient power and conviction as when He was actually in visible presence on the earth. Hence, when Ignatius had encountered persons who refused to believe his teaching, unless it could be found in the archives or charters, he had summarily dismissed their objections by appealing to Christ as the only archive or charter of the faith: "To me Jesus Christ is in the place of the archives; His cross and death and resurrection, and the faith which is by Him, are undefiled monuments of antiquity."

But to the mind of the church leaders in the second century, confronted with this same objection on a vastly larger scale, the answer of Ignatius must have seemed insufficient, as if a transcendental evasion. Instead of waiving the appeal to the charters, the conviction grew

that it must be carried to the charters, and that by the witness of the archives the faith of the church must stand or fall. This conviction became the ruling idea by the middle of the second century, the time when Gnosticism had reached the greatest extent of its influence. The Gnostics themselves were also embarrassed by this reference to the archives. When they were challenged to produce the authority by which they were teaching doctrines that contradicted the first principles of the Christian faith, they fell back upon some secret tradition, which they averred had been handed down from Christ and His Apostles; or they appealed to writings which passed under the name of Apostles; or they contended that the true writings of the Apostles had been falsified, and that they alone preserved the genuine tradition. It was the Gnostics who first carried the appeal to the writings of Apostles, *i.e.* of the original Twelve, as being the necessary media by which the teaching of Christ had been preserved. Christian teachers boldly took up the challenge, and from this time the Apostles grew stronger in the church and in the popular imagination, as if the divine, infallible authorities on whom the churches built as their foundation. With the exception of St. Paul, the memory of the larger Apostolate, of those other seventy, also, whom Christ sent forth, grew weak and faded away. To this restricted Apostolate, was now attributed the planting of all the churches and their primary instruction in its faith and order. The short summaries of Christian belief which the churches possessed and cherished, and in which they made their protest against Gnostic errors, were credited with Apostolic origin. Collections of the writings of the Apostles began to be made, lists of the books which were to form the New Testament Canon, from which were excluded any treatises which could not justly claim an Apostle for their author. Under the name of Apostles a large fictitious literature had been produced, chiefly by the Gnostics, Gospels attributed to Apostles, Acts of each separate Apostle. These were eventually condemned as spurious and found no place in the Canon.

It was in this exigency that the significance of the bishop's office took further increase. The bishop in each community became the voucher for the tradition, or for the genuineness of the sacred writings. If the Apostles had provided for the preservation of the faith, by writing, or causing to be written, records of the sayings of Christ, they must also have provided the guarantees for the integrity of these writings, and these guarantees must be the bishops. The bishops, as it was also reasoned, must have been, in the first instance, appointed by the Apostles in every church which they planted, and thus a succession of bishops in every parish or community could vouch for the documents, Scriptures, or Rules of Faith, since each bishop had in turn received them from his predecessors. Historical knowledge and research were superseded as unnecessary in the presence of this great and growing conviction. So completely did the bishop or pastor of the local church answer to the needs of the imagination and the requirements of the emergency, that it became at last difficult to understand that any other arrangement had ever existed. What was needed was one trustworthy man in each community of Christians, who could certify that the faith, as incorporated in some form of sound words, had been received by him from his predecessor in office. Age or length of days was no longer necessary as a qualification to this end. A process so simple superseded the more complex process by which presbyters held anxious communion with their elders, burdening their memories with the facts, the words, the discourses, which had come down through the generations. Such presbyters were getting rare by the middle of the second century; and there is a natural limit, too, beyond which tradition thus preserved begins to lose its value. The time comes when it must be incorporated in letters, in book, or document, for whose genuineness the voucher of an institution is all that is required. When that moment came, somewhere after the middle of the second century, the ancient presbyter disappeared and the bishop took his place. For the personal qualification of the individual officer was

substituted the administrator, whose qualification lay in his relation to the institution.

II

There are several living pictures in which this transition from the age of Ignatius to the age of Irenæus and Tertullian may be clearly traced. When Papias, who is known as the Bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia († 160 c.), felt called to the mission of collecting the actual words of Christ, he resorted to the presbyters for information.[1] He is said by Irenæus to have been an ancient man who was a hearer of John and a friend of Polycarp. He himself tells us:

"Whatsoever instructions I received with care at any time from the elders (πρεσβυτέρων) and stored up with care in my memory, I shall not be unwilling to put down, along with my interpretations, assuring you at the same time of their truth. For I did not, like the multitude, take pleasure in those who spoke much, but in those who taught the truth; nor in those who related strange commandments, but in those who rehearsed the commandments given by the Lord to faith and proceeding from truth itself. If, then, any one who had attended on the elders (πρεσβυτέροις) came, I asked minutely after their sayings,—what Andrew or Peter said, or what was said by Philip or by Thomas or by John or by Matthew, or by any other of the Lord's disciples: which things Aristion and the presbyter John, the disciples of the Lord, say."[2]

There was another ancient man, Hegesippus by name († 180 c.), who felt a similar call, but who in seeking to ascertain whether the churches were keeping the tradition, resorted not to the presbyters as such for information, but to the bishops. The verification of the tradition, in his view, lay in the succession of the bishops, of whom, in the case of Rome at least, he attempted a list. The pas-

[1] The fragments of Papias are given in Routh, *Reliq. Sac.*, Vol. I. Also trans. in *Apos. Fathers*, Vol. I., Ante-Nicene Library.

[2] For other allusions to the presbyters, cf. Papias, Frag. iv., v., vi. Some things that Papias gained from the presbyters were trifling in importance and even puerile. It was his method which is significant.

sage in which he speaks of the result of his investigations is an interesting one:

"And the church of Corinth continued in the true faith until Primus was bishop there, with whom I held familiar conversation (as I passed many days at Corinth) when I was on the point of sailing to Rome, during which time also we were mutually refreshed in the true doctrine. After coming to Rome I made my stay with Anicetus, whose deacon was Eleutherus. After Anicetus Soter succeeded, and after him Eleutherus. In every succession, however, and in every city the doctrine prevails according to what is declared by the law and the prophets and the Lord" (Eus. *H. E.* iv. 22).

Not far from the time when Hegesippus wrote, Irenæus, in his remote home in Gaul, was also alive to the importance of verifying the tradition. In his letter to Florinus he has left us a picture of the highest value and beauty, where, by the chain of personal contact, he himself can almost make an appeal to the Christ in the flesh for evidence of the truth which he holds. These doctrines which the Gnostics were teaching, he tells Florinus:

"These doctrines were never delivered to thee by the presbyters before us, those who were the immediate disciples of the Apostles. For I saw thee when I was yet a boy in Lower Asia with Polycarp, moving in great splendor at court, and endeavoring by all means to gain his esteem. I remember the events of those times much better than those of more recent occurrence. As the studies of our youth, growing with our minds, unite with them so firmly, I can tell also the very place where the blessed Polycarp was accustomed to sit and discourse; and also his entrances, his walks, the complexion of his life, and the form of his body, and his conversations with the people, and his familiar intercourse with John, as he was accustomed to tell, as also his familiarity with those that had seen the Lord. How he also used to relate their discourses and what things he had heard from them concerning the Lord. Also concerning his miracles, his doctrine, —all these were told by Polycarp in consistency with the Holy Scriptures, as he had received them from the eye-witnesses of the doctrine of salvation. These things, by the mercy of God and the opportunity then afforded me, I attentively heard, noting them down, not on paper, but in my heart; and these same facts I am always in the habit by the grace of God to recall faithfully to mind. And I can bear witness in the sight of God that if that blessed and apostolic presbyter (Polycarp) had heard any such thing as this, he would have cried out, and have stopped his ears" (Eus. *H. E.* v. 20).

Valuable and beautiful as is this unique testimony to tradition, it meant more to Irenæus than to the church at large. The conviction which it embodied could not be imparted in its full strength to all or any who, unlike Irenæus, were not links in the living chain. But under its influence, Irenæus at least was incited to urge the value of the presbyter as the connecting link with the past, and the bishop is presented as the guarantee of the faith, because he holds the rank of the presbyter. In his Treatise against Heretics he speaks of the "tradition which is preserved by means of the successions of presbyters" (iii. 2); of the "truth which has come down by means of the successions of the bishops" (iii. 3): "wherefore it is incumbent to obey the presbyters who are in the church, those who possess the succession from the Apostles, together with the succession of the episcopate" (iv. 26, 2). "Such presbyters does the church nourish . . . for these also preserve this faith of ours in God" (iv. 26, 5). There are other passages in Irenæus in which he seems to assert without qualification that there is no other means of ascertaining truth, or verifying its possession, except through the traditions of the presbyters: "When we refer them (the Gnostics) to that tradition which originates from the Apostles and is preserved by means of the successions of presbyters in the churches, they object to tradition, saying that they themselves are wiser not merely than the presbyters, but even than the Apostles, because they have discovered the unadulterated truth" (iii. 2, 2).

These passages, and others of a similar kind, indicate that the mind of Irenæus vacillated between two methods of certifying the genuineness of the revelation,—the aged presbyter who vouches for the tradition and the bishop who, in his official capacity, guarantees the Canon of New Testament writings or the Rules of Faith. When the aged presbyter, as in the case of Polycarp, or even in his own case, was also a bishop, the two methods coalesced, with the result that there is a seeming identification between the offices of bishop and presbyter. It was the appearance, after the middle of the second century,

of the Rules of Faith expanded from simpler Apostolic germs to meet the false teaching of the Gnostics, together with the attempts to fix the Canon of the New Testament, — these were among the causes which were destroying the prestige of the presbyter and transforming the original conception of his office. A youthful bishop was entirely competent to certify to the records, which he had received from his predecessors, while presbyters, like Irenæus and Polycarp, who maintained, as it were, a tactual descent of tradition from the Apostles by the living voice, were growing rare. The argument of Irenæus, therefore, culminates in the episcopate, as the bulwark of faith against the encroachments of Gnosticism. In his writings is found the first statement of the theory known as the Apostolical Succession:[1]

"It is within the power, therefore, of all in every church who may wish to see the truth, to contemplate clearly the tradition of the Apostles, manifested throughout the whole world; and we are in a position to reckon up those who were by the Apostles instituted bishops in the churches, and the successions of these men to our own times. . . . For they were very desirous that these men should be very perfect and blameless in all things, whom they were also leaving behind as their successors, delivering up their own place of government to these men. . . . Since, however, it would be very tedious in such a volume as this to reckon up the successions of all the churches, we do put to confusion all those who, in whatever manner, whether by an evil self-pleasing, by vain glory, or by blindness and perverse opinion, assemble in unauthorized meetings, by indicating that tradition derived from the Apostles, of the very great, the very ancient, and universally known church founded and organized at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul; as also the faith preached to men, which comes down to our time by means of the successions of the bishops. For it is a matter of necessity that every church should agree (*convenire*) with this church on account of its pre-eminent author-

[1] That the bishops were originally instituted as successors of the Apostles, has been inferred by Rothe, among others, from a passage in Clement's *Epistle to the Corinthians* (c. xliv.), according to which the Apostles gave instructions that "when *they* should fall asleep, other approved men should succeed to their office." But 'they' manifestly refers to those whom they had appointed, and not to the Apostles themselves. "They, the Apostles, appointed the foresaid persons, and afterwards provided a continuance, that if these should fall asleep, other approved men should succeed to their ministrations."

ity (*potiorem principalitatem*), that is, the faithful everywhere, inasmuch as the apostolical tradition has been preserved continuously by these (the faithful) who exist everywhere. The blessed Apostles, then, having founded and built up the church, committed into the hands of Linus the office of the episcopate. Of this Linus, Paul makes mention in the Epistles to Timothy. To him succeeded Anacletus; and after him, in the third place from the Apostles, Clement was allotted the bishopric. This man, as he had seen the blessed Apostles, and had been conversant with them, might be said to have the preaching of the Apostles still echoing and their tradition before his eyes" (Adv. Haer. iii., c. 3, 1, 2, 3).[1]

A still more forcible and explicit statement of the doctrine of Apostolic succession was made by Tertullian

[1] It is with the theory of Irenæus that we are here concerned, and not so much with the facts which he alleges in its support. He goes beyond the evidence of history when he affirms that the church at Rome was founded by Peter and Paul. Paul did not go to Rome till the year 61 A.D., and the church was already planted there when he wrote his Epistle to the Romans, as also many years before Peter made his visit to Rome. It is only admissible to speak of their founding the Roman church in the sense of their having exerted an influence upon it. The statement that they appointed Linus as the first bishop cannot therefore be taken literally. The identification of Clement of Rome with the Clement mentioned in the Epistle to the Philippians is without sufficient authority and is disputed by Bishop Lightfoot. It is unfortunate that the text of the famous passage in which Irenæus speaks of the Roman church as having a superior principality, is a Latin translation from a Greek original which is lost. For a discussion of the rendering of this passage, cf. Gieseler, *Ec. His.*, I., p. 150; also Neander, *Ch. His.*, Vol. I., p. 284 (Bohn ed.), who gives the following free translation: "On account of the rank which this church maintains as the *ecclesia urbis*, all churches, that is, believers from all countries, must—the *must* lies in the nature of the case—come together there; and since now from the beginning Christians from all countries must come together there, it follows that the Apostolic tradition has been preserved from generation to generation by the Christians from all countries who are there united together. Every deviation from it would here fall immediately under the observation of all."

For a discussion of the early lists of Roman bishops, cf. Lightfoot, *Apos. Fathers*, Part I., Vol. I., § 5; Harnack, *Die Zeit des Ignatius*, 1878; Lipsius, *Neue Studien zur Papstchronologie* in *Jahrb. f. Prot. Theol.*, 1879, 1880. That there was still a plural episcopate at Rome at the close of the first century, and that the relation between presbyters and bishops was not yet fixed according to the Ignatian scheme is plain from Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians. The list of Roman bishops in the first century cannot be so well accredited as are these circumstances. For the lists of bishops in Eusebius, cf. Lipsius, *Die Bischofslisten des Eusebius*, in *Jahrb. f. Prot. Theol.*, 1880.

(† 220 c.) in his famous treatise on The Prescription of Heretics. Tertullian followed Irenæus in the next generation, and was moved as Irenæus had been by the vagaries of Gnostic teaching. According to his argument, as contained in the Prescription, Christ chose the twelve disciples to be at His side and destined them to be the teachers of the nations. After Judas fell, He commanded the eleven others on His departure to the Father to go and teach the nations, who were to be baptized into the Father and into the Son and into the Holy Ghost. Immediately, therefore, did the Apostles, whom this designation indicates as 'the sent,' go forth upon their mission. "Having on the authority of prophecy, which occurs in a psalm of David, chosen Matthias by lot as the twelfth, into the place of Judas, they obtained the promised power of the Holy Ghost for the gift of miracle and of utterance; and after first bearing witness to the faith in Jesus Christ throughout Judea and founding churches, they next went forth into the world and preached the same doctrine of the same faith to the nations. They then in like manner founded churches in every city, from which all the other churches, one after another, derived the tradition of the faith, and the seeds of doctrine, and are every day deriving them, that they may become churches. Indeed, it is on this account only that they will be able to deem themselves Apostolic as being the offspring of Apostolic churches" (De Præs. Hæret., c. xx.). "From this therefore do we draw up our rule. Since the Lord Jesus Christ sent the Apostles to preach, no others ought to be received as preachers than those whom Christ appointed; for no man knoweth the Father save the Son and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him. Nor does the Son seem to have revealed Him to any others than the Apostles whom He sent forth to preach" (c. xxi.). "Let the heretics then produce the original records of their churches; let them unfold the roll of their bishops, running down in due succession from the beginning in such a manner that their first bishop shall be able to show for his ordainer and predecessor some one of the Apostles or of

Apostolic men, a man, moreover, who continued steadfast with the Apostles. For this is the manner in which the Apostolic churches transmit their registers: as the church of Smyrna, which records that Polycarp was placed therein; as also the church of Rome, which makes Clement to have been ordained in like manner by Peter. In exactly the same way the other churches likewise exhibit those whom, as having been appointed to their episcopal places by Apostles, they regard as transmitters of the Apostolic seed" (c. xxxii.).

It is evident from these passages that the presbyters have now finally lost their original function as the bearers of the tradition, which has been transferred to the bishops or pastors of the local churches. Since the time of Ignatius the churches have been organized on the basis, for the most part, of one bishop as the head of the community, and the presbyters have become his delegates to perform those functions which had hitherto belonged to the bishop alone; but the bishop has also changed, for he has absorbed the presbyter's commission of handing down or guaranteeing the Christian tradition. There was an interchange or exchange of functions by which the highest purpose of the episcopate is now and henceforth identified with the guardianship of the faith, while as the congregations increase in any town or city, the presbyter, at the bishop's direction, takes the superintendence of the worship. The distinction is a subtle but most important one; it underlies the ecclesiastical arrangements of the Catholic church, and when its full significance is seen, it explains the later readjustments of the Christian ministry. It should also be observed that when the bishop appropriates the presbyter's function of vouching for the tradition, he does so in his official character, as an administrator of ecclesiastical affairs. What had hitherto been a spiritual function requiring spiritual aptitudes of mind and heart, as seen in Papias or Polycarp or Irenæus, now tends to become an administrative act, or part of the routine of official observance. Irenæus furnishes the illustration, when he compares the Apostles to rich men depositing

their money in a bank, from which all may draw, of which bishops are the cashiers or custodians. But in taking the superintendence of the worship under the direction of the bishop, the presbyter is henceforth charged with a spiritual function, in place of that which he had lost, which is to become the germ of a great development.

It is further to be inferred from Tertullian's statement that the name of Apostle had now become restricted to the limited Apostolate of the Twelve. The larger Apostolate, of which a glimpse was caught in the Didache as it was on the eve of its disappearance, is unknown to Tertullian, even those other seventy also, whom Christ sent forth with Apostolic commission, whose names, forgotten on earth, are written in heaven. The identification of the Apostolate with the Twelve began much earlier than the age of Tertullian,[1] but in his time it was complete and was bringing forth its fruit in a disposition to refer all arrangements of ecclesiastical order or internal discipline or cultus to the authority or initiative of the Twelve. Thus has finally passed away the first rank of officials in the spiritual order, as when St. Paul declared that God had appointed first Apostles; secondly, prophets; thirdly, teachers; or again Christ gave some Apostles and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers.

III

We turn now to the passing of the prophets, who in the early years of the second century were still seen performing their peculiar work, and were held in the highest honor. It is the characteristic of the highest and most precious of divine gifts and endowments that they are most easily depraved and stand nearest, as it were, to the brink of failure. Even in St. Paul's time, when the prophets are mentioned, cautions are given against the abuses which wait so closely upon their order. As time went on these evils had not diminished, counterfeits were

[1] Cf. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* xxxix., 1.

current in the churches which called for special diligence in their detection. In the Didache the communities were warned against false prophets; and Hermas, who is the special champion of their order, is earnest in the exposure of those who were exploiting the church in their own interest under the guise of prophecy. But the order of prophets did not finally disappear until after a loud and long and bitter protest. The essence of the movement or sect known as Montanism was an earnest endeavor either to retain in the churches or else to revive and rejuvenate the spirit of prophecy.

But prophecy was a spiritual function which hindered the growth of the Catholic church; it was incompatible with the orderly administration of worship; it was an incongruity, to which the pastor or bishop could not be reconciled. The prophet might at any moment lend the weight of his utterance to thwarting the plans of the bishop, who sought practical ends and practical means of attaining them. If we may speak at all of a great crisis or revolution in the early church, it appeared at the moment when the Catholic church became conscious of its mission through the successful administration of the bishop's office. For it was a characteristic of the episcopate from the beginning, that it studied to cultivate unity in the congregation as the means of promoting its welfare. The bishop was not devoted to aspirations which were possible only for a few; he kept at heart the welfare of the whole; he sought to extend the influence of the church, and primarily to recommend it by its gracious results to the heathen world. For it was a foremost characteristic among the bishop's qualifications, that he should be a man of honest report, and, as the Apostolic Ordinances add, of a good reputation among the heathen. To meet and conquer for Christ the heathen population of the Empire, to rouse the indifferent, to make the worship intelligible and attractive to the common people, to teach the young, to discipline the mind and conscience by the observance of law, — such was the rôle of the bishop, such also was the tendency inherent in the nature of the office. The

Catholic church was tending, consciously or unconsciously, in its formative process during the second century, toward what is called the principle of solidarity, the fusion of the individual into an organic body where the interests of the few are subordinated to the well-being of the whole.

Against this tendency, which was fast becoming the ruling motive of Catholicism, the Montanists rose up in protest and rebellion, invoking the spirit of the prophet, and of the Holy Ghost who speaks by the prophets, to stem the tide of secularism, which seemed to be sweeping away the church from its ancient moorings. The true aim of the church, according to the Montanist conception, was to build up the individual man into a higher religious life, to cultivate the higher reaches of Christian piety, to nourish the spiritually minded with the strong meat of the Word. The Montanist was indifferent to the growth of the church by the multiplication of its numbers; to keep the church small was to keep it pure. Prophecy appeals only to the spiritual few, not to the carnal many, as when St. Paul lamented, in his letter to the Corinthians, that he was unable to write to them as spiritual, because they were yet carnal. The utterance of the prophet was unintelligible except to those who had the spiritual mind. The canons of prophecy had been laid down by St. Paul when he said, "The Spirit searcheth all things, even the deep things of God. The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned" (1 Cor. ii. 10–16, iii. 1–3).

It was, then, in the name of the Spirit that the Montanists called for a reformation of the church, for a halt, and a reversal of its movement. The Montanist prophets issued their reformatory ordinances, rigid and prolonged fastings, abstention from all worldly amusements, the avoidance of heathen society and heathen customs, the condemnation of science and literature and philosophy as leading to an intellectualism incompatible with piety, and, in a word, the disapproval of the ordinary life of men in this world, the marrying and the giving in mar-

riage. The end of all things was at hand, and the coming of Christ was near, — to these convictions, to which the Catholic church seemed oblivious, the Montanist was keenly alive. An evil hour was impending, for which the Christian man should fortify himself by a severe régime; and when the persecution fell, he was to stand at his post and not to flee, to welcome martyrdom as bringing him home to Christ. But such ordinances as these could not be enforced upon the generality of men, even if they were true or desirable in themselves. They were not contained in the writings of the New Testament, but were set forth as of inspired authority by Montanists who claimed the prophetic gift. Not only were they resisted by the united episcopate of the Catholic church, but the method of their utterance was condemned as false. For here we strike the fatal weakness of the Montanist conception of prophecy, that the personality of the prophet was to be suppressed, in order that the Spirit might play upon him as a lyre. The Montanist prophets spoke from the condition of a trance, and their whole conception of prophecy violated another canon of St. Paul, that the spirits of the prophet are subject to the prophet. Such was the crisis when the Catholic church arose to a fuller conception of its mission, and suppressed a movement obnoxious in itself and fatal to the vision which it cherished. Under these melancholy circumstances the last vestiges of the ancient and divine order of the prophets disappeared from the Catholic church.

Tertullian, after championing the Catholic church as its most stalwart defender, and after giving the formula of Apostolic succession as the principle by which its authority could be best maintained, left the Catholic church and joined the sect of the Montanists. That feature of the rising Catholicism against which as a Montanist he rebelled was its tendency to shut up the divine revelation to the letter of a book or charter, instead of leaving the heavens opened so that God might speak if He would and impart new life to His church. As a Montanist he did not feel that he needed the theory of Apostolic suc-

67817

cession, in order to the certitude of his faith; he thought of the Holy Spirit as the highest guarantee of the truth, that Spirit of whom Christ had said that He should come to His disciples and dwell in them as an abiding guest: "He shall take of mine and shall show it unto you; bringing all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you." A divine spirit in humanity as the guarantee of the faith, over against the charters vouched for by the bishops, such was the contrast and the conflict illustrated by the two phases of experience through which the soul of Tertullian passed.[1]

The Catholic church came to its task, as an ecclesiastical organization, with a definite purpose, through its successful resistance to Gnosticism and Montanism; the term 'Catholic,' as its technical designation, first began to be employed toward the close of the second century. From both movements the church gained elements of strength and direction: from Gnosticism, the recognition of Christ as having a world relationship, and the need of Greek culture and philosophy as aids in the formation of a consistent theology; from Montanism, the deeper conviction of the Spirit's presence and power in the ecclesiastical organization. There was, indeed, an adjustment of the issue with Montanism, despite the severe condemnation which it received. From this time, it came to be believed that the Spirit was the special endowment of the episcopate, manifesting itself through the utterance of bishops assembled in councils. The older view, that the call to

[1] The movement known as Montanism originated in Phrygia soon after the middle of the second century. Its influence was felt in Asia Minor, Rome, and Gaul, and in North Africa. The Montanistic writings of Tertullian reveal the later phase of the movement, which is different from the earlier type in accepting the Catholic organization under the episcopate. Cf. Bonwetsch, *Die Geschichte des Montanismus*, 1881; De Soyres, *Montanism and the Primitive Church*, 1878; Cunningham, *The Churches of Asia*, 1880; Réville, *Tertullien et le Montanisme*, in *Rev. des Deux Mondes*, 1864; Art. *Montanismus*, by Moeller, in Herzog, *R. E.*; also Ritschl, *Entstehung*, etc., who first discerned the significance of the movement. Among earlier writers Neander dwelt on its Phrygian origin, Baur on its tenet of the nearness of the coming of Christ, as the clew to its purport.

the ministry was but a recognition of the previous qualification of the candidate by the influence of the Spirit, tended to give way to the view that the ministry received the Spirit on the occasion of its appointment to sacred functions, as the means of their performance. But while this view elevated the ministry which was now to take the place of Apostles, prophets, and teachers, yet it was defective in that it tied the Holy Spirit to the organized ministry of the church, — that Spirit whose larger characteristic is that it bloweth where it listeth; whose sound we hear, but cannot tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth. This adjustment, therefore, of the issue with Montanism was not a final one. The obscure prophet of Phrygia had raised the eternal question of the ages. On the one hand, administration and order, the well-being of the church in its collective capacity, the sacred book, the oral voice of the Master, the touch of the vanished hand, the perpetuation as of a bodily presence, some physical chain, as it were, which should bind the generations together, so that they should continue visibly and tangibly to hand on the truth and the life from man to man; and on the other hand the freedom of the Spirit, and the open heaven of revelation, individual opportunity for the fullest development and expression, the transcendental vision, as with St. Paul, who declares that "though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet henceforth know we him no more," the vision by which each soul may see Christ for himself through direct and immediate communion with the Spirit of God, that Spirit whose testimony within the soul is the supreme authority and ground of certitude, who takes of the things of Christ and reveals them to men with fresh power and new conviction, who can at any moment authorize initiations of change and progress, which yet do not and cannot break the succession of a continuous life of the Spirit in the churches, — such were the terms of the real issue between Catholicism and Montanism, which still wait, after eighteen centuries, for some larger or final adjustment. If Catholicism erred in one direction, Mon-

tanism erred in another. It was necessary that prophetism should retire for a while in order to its discipline and purification, until it should regain its self-possession, and reappear in the fulness of time with all its ancient authority and prestige. The true mission of the Catholic church was to train the peoples committed to its charge till they should be competent and once more worthy for the reception of God's highest gift to man.

The suppression of the Montanist prophets and the discouragement of the spirit of prophetism in general, seemed to close an important avenue by which the influence of the Spirit might continue to act upon the individual reason and conscience, making them the vehicles of the divine voice speaking to the churches. Such an avenue had been open to Ignatius, when he heard the voice of the Spirit proclaiming, Do nothing without the bishops. The method which was substituted for this channel of individual conviction and authority was the utterance of the bishops in concert, when assembled in councils. But such an organic procedure in solidarity did not fully meet the exigencies of human progress. Individual initiative and influence must always precede the action of a body of men who have met to affirm the truth. It is also impossible to annihilate an agency which, like ancient Christian prophecy, implied the freedom of the individual man to utter his entire thought with all the impressive sanctions of deep conviction. Hence, in some respects, there was but a change of form, and certainly for the worse, when the individual was henceforth driven to expression in devious, if not in dishonest, ways. From this time date those romances of unknown authorships which purported to be genuine history, of which the pseudo-Clementine writings are a conspicuous instance; treatises also attributed to the Apostles, such as the so-called Apostolic Constitutions, which altered the organization of the church in the name of tradition, and introduced the changes of Catholic usage, which the needs of the time seemed to demand, by the alleged authority of the Twelve. The church was at the mercy of that tra-

dition which had been mercilessly invoked to suppress Gnostic teachers and Montanist prophets. The interpolations in approved writers, the forgeries, which by the slight change of a word could reverse the plain statements of an author, this method by which much of the ancient Christian literature has been so manipulated that it must be approached with suspicion, and tested by critical inquiry before it can be received as genuine, may be traced to the suppression of individual freedom as it sought utterance in the garb of prophecy, the only outlet which human ingenuity could invent in order to get a hearing for the truth.

Among the Minor Orders of the Catholic church there is an office known as the Reader, which in the light of modern research has been disclosed as the last relic of the ancient prophetic order.[1] The Reader stands now next above the janitor; but in the second century, when the transition took place from the ministry of the Apostolic church to the Catholic form of organization, the Reader occupied a place between the presbyter and the deacons. Thus the Apostolic Ordinances, which may belong to the latter part of the second century, describe four orders of ministers, — bishops, presbyters, readers, deacons. In the first of these Ordinances, or canons, it is required of a bishop that he should be "in a position to expound the Scriptures; but if he is unlearned, then he must be gentle

[1] To Dr. Harnack belongs the credit of this discovery, which in its significance for the history of the Christian ministry is hardly less important than the discovery of the Didache. Dr. Harnack has also first studied the relationships of the minor orders, and revealed their deep significance for the growth of the ministry. Cf. *Die Quellen der Sogenannten Apostolischen Kirchenordnung, nebst einer Untersuchung über den Ursprung des Lectorats und des anderen niederen Weihen*, in Gebhardt u. Harnack, *Texte u. Untersuch.*, Bd. II., § 5. The so-called *Apostolic Ordinances* must not be confused with the later *Apostolical Constitutions*, where much that is given in the former work is set aside as no longer applicable to the changed conditions of the ecclesiastical organization. See also (Eng. Trans.) *Sources of the Apostolic Canons, etc., with Treatise on the Origin of the Readership*, by Wheatly, with *Introd. Essay*, by Owen, London, 1895.

and filled with love to all, so that a bishop should never be as one accused of anything by the multitude." The Reader was a substitute for prophet and teacher at a moment when bishop and presbyter might be unable to read or incompetent to preach. The qualifications of the Reader are given in the third of these Apostolic Ordinances:

"For reader, one should be appointed after he has been carefully proved; no babbler, nor drunkard, nor jester; of good morals, submissive, of benevolent intentions, first in the assembly at the meetings on the Lord's day, of a plain utterance and capable of clearly expounding, mindful that he rules in the place of an evangelist (εὐαγγελιστοῦ); for whoever fills the ear of the ignorant will be accounted as having his name written with God."

It is a striking circumstance that the Reader should be classed here with the order of evangelists, of whom Philip was one (Acts xxi. 8), and also Timothy (2 Tim. iv. 5), who are said to be of Christ's appointment: "He gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists" (Eph. iv. 11). In the formal consecration to his office the Reader was also assigned the compensation for his work which the prophet had received (*εἰς τιμὴν τῶν προφετῶν*),[1] and further in the prayer by which he was consecrated to his task he was reminded that his office called for the prophetic endowment: "Give to him the Holy Spirit, the spirit of the prophet."[2] As bishops and presbyters gradually assumed the work of preaching and expounding the Scriptures, the office of the Reader lost its importance, till he was no longer a necessary official in the congregation. Then he was thrust down from his high position to one next to the lowest among the minor orders; but the name was retained, pointing to some organic change in the structural constitution of the church by which he had become reduced to a disused rudimentary member of the body ecclesiastic.

[1] *Apos. Cons.* ii. 28.

[2] *Apos. Cons.* viii. 22, Δὸς αὐτῷ πνεῦμα ἅγιον, πνεῦμα προφητῶν.

CHAPTER VIII

THE AGE OF CYPRIAN

THE age of Cyprian, which coincides with the first half of the third century († 258), witnessed great changes in the organization of the Catholic church, and these changes are reflected in the development of the episcopate. The bishop, who had been hitherto for the most part the pastor of the local church, was beginning to pass over into the diocesan bishop; while the presbyterate, which had at first been an office connected with the defence of the faith and with the cure of souls as well as with discipline, was assuming the bishop's function of administering the eucharist. This was the moment when the church was growing in the cities where the original single community was expanding into several congregations. Such was the situation in Carthage, of which Cyprian was bishop.

The expansion of the bishop's superintendence of the local church in any town or city to what is known as diocesan episcopacy or the bishop's superintendence of a number of churches, is connected with the influence of the ancient civilization, where the town or city was the unit, and not as in modern civilization, the individual. In the modern church, if a new congregation is to be established in any town, the individual members who compose it do not regard themselves as dependent upon the original community, but call their own minister, and thus become a distinct organization, as complete in itself as that from which it has separated. But in the ancient world, where individualism was undeveloped, the new congregation would naturally remain under the supervision of the bishop who represented the unity of the *civitas*, and receive from him a pastor, subordinate to his au-

thority and acting as his delegate. For this purpose the presbyters were utilized whose original function as defenders of the faith had lapsed, and who were now employed for a practical end in what must be regarded as an efficient administrative method. As the presbyter thus fell under the supervision of the bishop, there could not have been at first any widespread disaffection with the arrangement, for it brought a new dignity to the presbyter when he was thus allowed to assume the important and honorable function of the bishop in presiding at the eucharist. His original function as a defender of the faith was henceforth appropriated exclusively by the bishop, who became the official curator of the charters, in his capacity as the one responsible head of the Christian communities, within the town or municipality. It was this type of episcopacy which prevailed in the ancient church. In the fifth century there were some four hundred and fifty bishops in North Africa alone. In Asia Minor the number of the bishops, according to Bingham, amounted to four hundred. Not only were the congregations increasing in the great cities beyond the power of the bishop alone to meet their needs, but in rural districts or in the country adjacent to the cities and large towns, congregations were forming, which raised the question as to their administration. In some cases a presbyter was put over them; in other cases a bishop was appointed, after the earlier Ignatian usage, who was known as the country bishop, or χωρεπίσκοπος.[1] The situation, therefore, had greatly changed since the time of Ignatius. The presbyters now threatened to encroach upon episcopal prerogatives, since they were taking the place of the earlier bishop and naturally fell heir to his honors and dignity. But the bishops had also received a large increase of dignity, as the parish grew into the later diocese. Hence came a period of rivalry and conflict. The presbyters seem jealous of the bishops who draw the deacons more closely to themselves, as if for their own protection. The third century is an age of schisms all more or less related to the attempt of the bishops to

[1] Cf. Bingham, *Chris. Antiq.*, B. II. 13.

assert their authority. In Rome, in Carthage, in Egypt, this issue may be traced in the schisms of Novatian, Felecissimus, or Meletius.

It was under these circumstances that Cyprian became the Bishop of Carthage, where he carried episcopal prerogative to its highest point, and succeeded in breaking down the presbyterial combinations which disputed his authority. Other issues were concerned, of course, beyond the principle of episcopal authority over the presbyter, but they were rather the occasions than the causes of conflict and controversy. Cyprian stands as the embodiment of the Roman genius of administration. It was no longer with him, as it had been in the age of Irenæus, the importance of the bishop or local pastor, who bears witness to the common faith and becomes the agent for its preservation. He was preoccupied with the Roman theory of the transmission of power, the necessity that it should descend in definite channels, the impossibility that it could be appropriated, as some honor which a man might take unto himself. This had been the attitude of Clement of Rome, in his Epistle to the Corinthians: God had given authority to Christ, Christ in turn had committed it to His Apostles, these had handed it on to the bishops and deacons. If presbyters were to have authority to minister to the congregation, they must derive it from the only source from which it could be obtained, the episcopate. Cyprian still continued to pay a seeming deference to the authority of the people, but it was in appearance only. The congregation of believers had no power from his point of view to appoint its officers; their part in the transaction was to be henceforth limited to yielding or withholding their approval. The question of ordination now assumes the foremost rank. Cyprian believed that in this rite was imparted to the recipient the gift of the Holy Spirit, which qualified him for the work of the ministry. It would have been lamentable indeed if this conviction had been absent when the transformation took place of the Christian ministry into a hierarchical administrative order, whose chief function was to be the sacerdotal

offering for the people; nor, indeed, without this conviction could the change have been accomplished. But none the less was the change significant and momentous. The earlier ministry had received its formal appointment because it already possessed the gift of the Spirit, and the outward act of approval, as in the laying on of hands, bore witness to the inward qualification. But, manifestly, an administrative office transmitting power for ecclesiastical acts could not qualify the recipient for the spiritual gifts of prophecy or teaching. Because the ministry was changing to a priesthood, and the performance of a ritual was to become the work of the clergy, ordination came to be regarded as the authorization for these functions, and rose at once to an issue of the highest importance.

I

In the New Testament there are three instances of appointment or ordination to the Christian ministry during the Apostolic age: (1) The Seven were chosen by the brethren, as men already filled with the Holy Ghost, and were then appointed (*καταστήσομεν*) by the Twelve, who also laid their hands upon them (Acts vi. 3–6). (2) At Antioch certain prophets and teachers were told by the Holy Spirit to separate Barnabas and Saul for the work to which the same Spirit had previously called them; and when they had fasted and prayed, the prophets and teachers laid their hands upon them. This was an ordination to the Apostolate (Acts xiii. 2). (3) Timothy was appointed an evangelist by three concurrent agencies: the gift which was in him came by prophecy and by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery (1 Tim. iv. 14), and by the laying on of the Apostle's hands (2 Tim. i. 6). There is then a formal ordination to a diaconate of some kind; there is an ordination of Apostles, by prophets and teachers, and an ordination of an evangelist. But there is no reference to any ordination of prophets and teachers themselves, for they needed or could have no formal warrant, since they appealed to the congregation to recognize in them the

direct call of the Spirit. They could be recognized or rejected, but not appointed. There is also an appointment or ordination of presbyters, but it is not said to be accompanied with the laying on of hands.[1] Barnabas and Saul are said to have ordained (χειροτονήσαντες) elders or presbyters in every city (Acts xiv. 23); Titus is said to have been left in Crete in order to ordain (καταστήσῃς) presbyters in every city (Titus i. 5). But there is no mention in the New Testament of the ordination of bishops or of the method by which they are appointed. If, as we must suppose, they were generally taken from the council of presbyters, it may have been that they were not then regarded as needing any additional ordination or consecration for their special work beyond their designation or appointment by the presbyters.

When we turn to the writings of the second century for information as to the mode of appointment to the ministry, we are struck by the absence of any allusion to the subject, even in writers who have the order of the church at heart. Clement of Rome tells us that the Apostles appointed the firstfruits of their labors to be bishops and deacons, giving instructions that these bishops and deacons at their death should be followed by other approved men. Those bishops and deacons therefore who were appointed by Apostles, or afterward "by men of repute," with the consent of the whole church, should not be unjustly thrust out from their ministration (Ad Cor. c. xliv.). But who were these "other men of repute"?

[1] The laying on of hands is mentioned in the New Testament in three connections: (1) The healing of the sick; (2) appointment to office; (3) as supplementing the rite of baptism, whether of John or in the name of Jesus only. Cf. Matt. ix. 13, xix. 15; Mark v. 23, vi. 3, xvi. 18; Luke iv. 10, xiii. 3; Acts vi. 6, viii. 17, 19, xiii. 3, xix. 6. For its significance in ordination, cf. Sohm, *Kirchenrecht*, I., § 7.

In his valuable monograph on Ordination, in *Dict. Chris. Antiq.*, Dr. Hatch remarks: "It is difficult to determine accurately the time at which χειροθετεῖσθαι came into general use in reference to ordination, because the texts of the MSS., especially of writers and councils of the fourth century, vary so much between χειροτονία and χειροθεσία as to make the determination of the reading, in the present state of criticism, as applied to patristic Greek, a matter of great uncertainty" (p. 1502).

They may have been the leaders (*ἡγούμενοι*) or the presbyters, but can hardly have been the bishops or deacons themselves. Again, in the Didache, when the prophets fail who preside at the Eucharist, the congregation is told "to appoint (*χειροτονήσατε*) for themselves bishops and deacons" (c. xv.). Although Ignatius had left his office, as bishop at Antioch, vacant, when he set out for Rome, and is concerned that it should be worthily filled, yet he gives no explicit instructions as to the manner of filling it, beyond the statement that a conference be called for the purpose. He urges the church at Philadelphia to send a deacon to this conference as their representative, remarking also that the nearest churches have sent in some cases bishops, in others presbyters and deacons (Phil. x.). That the bishop was to be elected at this council is stated in the Epistle to Polycarp (c. vii.), but there is silence in regard to any further solemnities connected with his election.

In the first of the so-called Apostolic Ordinances, which represent, according to Dr. Harnack, the transition from the situation represented in the Didache to that which was reached by the end of the second century, we have a naïve description of the making of a bishop in some remote or rural community: "If there are few men and not twelve persons who are competent to vote at the election of a bishop, the neighboring churches should be written to, where any of them is a settled one, in order that three selected men may come thence and examine carefully if he is worthy, that is, if he has a good report among the heathen, if he is faultless, if a friend of the poor," etc.[1] From this Ordinance it may be inferred that if there were twelve men in a community competent to vote, it was not required that they should go outside the community for assistance in electing a bishop. One may

[1] *Texte u. Untersuch.* II., § 5, p. 7 (Eng. Trans. by Wheatly, p. 8): *Ἐὰν ὀλιγανδρία ὑπάρχῃ καὶ μήπου πλῆθος τυγχάνῃ τῶν δυναμένων ψηφίσασθαι περὶ ἐπισκόπου ἐντὸς δεκαδύο ἀνδρῶν, εἰς τὰς πλησίον ἐκκλησίας, ὅπου τυγχάνει πεπηγυῖα, γραφέτωσαν, ὅπως ἐκεῖθεν ἐκλεκτοὶ τρεῖς ἄνδρες παραγενόμενοι δοκιμῇ δοκιμάσαντες τὸν ἄξιον ὄντα.*

note, also, that these three invited visitors are not specified as officers, but are apparently laymen. In the second of these Apostolic Ordinances, where the duties and qualifications of the presbyters are given, they are represented as placed on either side of the bishop in the celebration of the Eucharist, but there is also reserved to them the supreme control in cases of discipline, both of the congregation and the bishop, in the communities which these documents represent.[1]

It is possible that another and different precedent for the making of a bishop was intended in the account given in the fictitious Clementine writings, toward the end of the second century, where Peter is represented as ordaining Clement to be his successor. Here, at least, but in an untrustworthy document, there is a clear and explicit statement of the procedure:

"But about that time, when he (Peter) was about to die, the brethren being assembled together, he suddenly seized my hand, and rose up, and said in presence of the church: 'Hear me, brethren and fellow-servants. Since, as I have been taught by the Lord and Teacher, Jesus Christ, whose Apostle I am, the day of my death is approaching, I lay hands upon this Clement as your bishop; and to him I intrust my chair of discourse, even to him who has journeyed with me from the beginning to the end, and thus has heard all my homilies; who, in a word, having had a share in all my trials, has been found steadfast in the faith; whom I have found, above all others, pious, philanthropic, pure, learned, chaste, good, upright, large-hearted, and striving generously to bear the ingratitude of some of the catechumens. Wherefore I communicate to him the power of binding and loosing, so that, with respect to everything which he shall ordain in the earth, it shall be decreed in the heavens. For he shall bind what ought to be bound, and loose what ought to be loosed, as knowing the rule of the church. Therefore hear him, as knowing that he who grieves the president of the truth sins against Christ and offends the Father of all.'"[2]

[1] *Texte u. Untersuch.* II., § 5, pp. 36, 37.

[2] *Epis. Clem.*, 2. That this method was followed in some places may be inferred from the 76th of the Apostolic Canons, forbidding a bishop to ordain whom he pleases, for it is not just to make heirs of the episcopate; or the 23d Canon of the Council of Antioch in 341, which forbids a bishop even at the time of his death to appoint his successor. Such appointments were to be held invalid.

In Alexandria there was another method of appointing a bishop, which continued until near the middle of the third century. The one bishop who presided over all Egypt lived in the great city surrounded by his twelve presbyters. When his office fell vacant, the presbyters deputed one of their number to take his place; or, in the words of St. Jerome, upon whose testimony our information rests, "The presbyters always named as bishop one of their own number chosen by themselves and placed in a more exalted position, just as an army elects a general or as deacons appoint one of themselves whom they know to be diligent and call him an archdeacon."[1] That there should have been twelve presbyters, with the one bishop, may add another illustration to what has been before remarked concerning the development of the ministry (see *ante*, p. 82), that it was inspired by a desire to perpetuate the scene of the last supper, when Christ presided at the

[1] *Ep. cxlvi. ad Evangelum:* Alexandriae a Marco evangelista usque ad Heraclam et Dionysium episcopos presbyteri semper unum ex se electum in excelsiori gradu collocatum episcopum nominabant, quomodo si exercitus imperatorem faciat, aut diaconi elegant de se, quem industrium noverint et archidiaconum vocent. "At the close of the second century, when every considerable church in Europe and Asia appears to have had its bishop, the only representative of the episcopal order in Egypt was the Bishop of Alexandria. It was Demetrius first (A.D. 190–233), as Eutychius informs us, who appointed three other bishops, to which number his successor Heraclas (A.D. 233–249) added twenty more. This extension of episcopacy to the provincial towns of Egypt paved the way for a change in the mode of appointing and ordaining a patriarch of Alexandria. But before this time it was a matter of convenience and almost of necessity that the Alexandrian presbyters should themselves ordain their chief" (Lightfoot, *Essay on the Christian Ministry*, p. 232). The testimony of Eutychius, the orthodox patriarch in Alexandria in the tenth century, confirms the testimony of Jerome: Constituit evangelista Marcus una cum Hakania patriarcha duodecim presbyteros, qui nempe cum patriarcha manerent, adeo ut eum vacaret patriarchatus, unum e duodecim presbyteris eligerent, cuius capiti reliqui undecim manus imponentes ipsi benedicerent et patriarcham crearent, deinde virum aliquem insignem eligerent, quem secum presbyterum constituerent, loco ejus, qui factus est patriarcha, ut ita semper exstarent duodecim. Neque desiit Alexandriae institutum hoc de presbyteris, ut scilicet patriarchas crearent ex presbyteris duodecim, usque ad tempora Alexandri patriarchae Alexandriae. Is autem vetuit, ne deinceps patriarcham presbyteri crearent. Et decrevit, ut mortuo patriarcha convenient episcopi, qui patriarcham ordinarent (Migne, *Patr. Graec.* CXI., p. 907).

table, surrounded by His twelve disciples. For this reason the bishop represented Christ in the thought of Ignatius, and the presbyters stood in the place of Apostles. But there may have been also in Alexandria a conception of the ministry which, like the Alexandrian theology, expresses another spirit from that which dominated Rome and the Western church. Clement of Alexandria gives a glimpse of this different attitude when, treating of dignities in the church on earth in their relation to degrees of glory in heaven, he writes:

"Those, then, also now, who have exercised themselves in the Lord's commandments and lived perfectly and gnostically according to the Gospel, may be enrolled in the chosen body of the Apostles. Such an one is in reality a presbyter of the church, and a true minister of the will of God, if he do and teach what is the Lord's; not as being ordained[1] by men nor regarded righteous because a presbyter, but enrolled in the presbyterate because righteous. And although here upon earth he be not honored with the chief seat, he will sit down on the four and twenty thrones, judging the people, as St. John says in the Apocalypse. . . . According to my opinion, the grades here in the church of bishops, presbyters, and deacons are imitations of the angelic glory and of that economy which, the Scriptures say, awaits those who, following the footsteps of the Apostles, have lived in perfection of righteousness according to the Gospel. For these taken up in the clouds, the Apostle writes, will first serve, then be classed in the presbyterate, by promotion in glory, — for glory differs from glory, — till they grow into a perfect man."[2]

II

It is in the letters of Cyprian that we get the first authoritative statement of the method to be followed in making a bishop, which in substance was to become universal in the Catholic church:

"You must diligently observe and keep the practice, delivered from divine tradition and apostolic observance, — which is also maintained among us, *and almost throughout all the provinces*, — that for the proper celebration of ordinations, all the neighboring bishops of the same province should assemble with that people for which a prelate is

[1] χειροτονούμενος, *elected.* [2] *Strom.* VI. 13.

ordained; and the bishop should be chosen in the presence of the people, who have most fully known the life of each one, and have looked into the doings of each one as respects his individual conduct."[1]

And this, Cyprian adds, was done in the case of "our colleague, Sabinus; so that by the suffrage of the whole brotherhood, and by *sentence* of the bishops assembled in their presence, the episcopate was conferred by him." It is to be noted in this account that there is no mention of the laying on of hands as the essential feature of ordination; the Episcopate is conferred by the sentence of the bishops. Whether the laying on of hands followed the sentence of the bishops, is undetermined by the text; but whether it did or not, ordination in the Cyprianic theory is not conceived as dependent upon it. If the handing on of authority by a verbal commission forms the essence of the ecclesiastical appointment, then the laying on of hands is reduced to a venerable accompaniment of the

[1] *Epis.* lxvii. 5. Cyprian is aware that this method does not yet prevail in some provinces of the church, and may have known of the usage in Alexandria. His confident appeal to "divine tradition and Apostolic observance" in its behalf may find its warrant in the writings of Ignatius (Ad Phil. c. x.), who calls upon the neighboring churches to aid in the appointment of a bishop for the church in Antioch. But Ignatius does not summon the bishops of these churches for this purpose, but asks the church in Philadelphia to send a deacon, remarking that other churches have sent in some cases bishops, in others presbyters and deacons. In the longer Greek recension of the Ignatian epistles, the request of Ignatius for a deacon from the church at Philadelphia is changed to the request for a bishop. Another precedent for the Cyprianic rule may be seen perhaps in the first of the so-called *Apostolic Ordinances* (see *ante*, p. 112). But the Cyprianic rule was also the result of natural growth and of a sense of the fitness of things. It is in use to-day among the Reformed churches, as well as those which follow more closely the ancient order. According to the *Canons of Hippolytus*, the laying on of hands is prescribed in making a bishop. When the consent of the people has been given, Deinde eligatur unus ex episcopis et presbyteris, qui manum capiti ejus imponat. Cf. Achelis, in *Texte u. Untersuch.*, 6, vi. *Die ältesten Quellen des orientalischen Kirchenrechtes. Erstes Buch, Die Canones Hippolyti*, p. 40. But according to the *Apostolic Constitutions*, while laying on of hands is prescribed in the ordination of presbyters and deacons, as also of the deaconess, the sub-deacon, and the reader, the bishop is ordained without the laying on of hands, for which is substituted the open book of the Gospels, held over his head by the deacons. Cf. B. viii. c. 3.

transaction. Had the laying on of hands been conceived as of the essence of the rite, it would surely have been mentioned by Cyprian. But herein lies a departure from the Apostolic form of ordination where the laying on of hands is regarded as of the essence of the rite, for the ordination consists in the recognition by the human actors of a call already made and a qualification already imparted by the Spirit. (Acts vi. xiii. 1, 2.)

In the Cyprianic rule for making a bishop there is both a method and a principle which inspires the method. The power to appoint the bishop is vested in the bishops of the province, and is no longer within the prerogative of the Christian community. The function of the people is limited to giving information as to the character of the man whom the bishops are to ordain; but it is indispensable also that the transaction should go on in their presence. The value of such a method is in guarding more carefully the entrance to the ministry. The bishops now appear as a body or consolidated corporation, acting in the interests of the whole church as well as those of the local community. In his treatise on the Unity of the Church, as elsewhere in his writings, Cyprian regards the whole body of the bishops as constituting the church, as the depositary of divine gifts and powers to be mediated through their agency to the congregation. The practical working of this doctrine would tend toward the promotion of the unity of the church, which Cyprian has close to his heart. In this respect he resembles Ignatius, in making union with the bishop essential to salvation. The bishops constitute the church, and outside of the church there is no salvation: "He that has not the church for his mother cannot have God for his father"; "the bishop is in the church, and the church is in the bishop; and if any one be not with the bishop, he is not in the church."[1] In his argument for the unity of the church Cyprian reflects the principle of Roman administration; and as, according to the imperial idea, the unity of the Empire takes its rise from one man, the sacred person of the emperor; so in

[1] *Epis.* lxviii. 8.

the church at large unity must have had its rise in one man, the Apostle Peter.[1]

But there is also a principle here which underlies the Cyprianic method of administration. Ecclesiastical power must be handed down from age to age in uniform and tangible fashion which is visible to all. While Cyprian dwells on the advantages of his method as contributing to unity, it is not merely or solely because of this advantage that it finds its warrant or justification. In the nature of the case, as Cyprian reasoned, there can be but one method by which the bishop obtains the qualification for his office: it must come from those who already hold the power and are able to confer it. This power the bishops retain in their own possession. In making a presbyter, they do not impart their whole power, but only sufficient power for the presbyterial office. Hence in the nature of the case a presbyter cannot make a bishop, for he cannot impart that which he does not possess. Nor can a presbyter ordain a presbyter, because this power of ordination the bishops reserve to themselves. What they impart to the presbyter is the right to perform certain ecclesiastical acts which are specified or understood, and any other acts which he may perform are lacking in validity. There must have been, therefore, in the church, so Cyprian reasoned, from the beginning, apart from any evidence for or against it, a succession of bishops from the Apostles' time who have handed down the gifts received by Apostles from Christ Himself. Otherwise there could have been no continuous ecclesiastical life. On this theory, Cyprian stakes the very existence of the church itself.

The tendency of Cyprian's doctrine of a succession of bishops reaching back to the Apostles was to overcome that sense of contingency about the ecclesiastical order of the church, which may be traced in many directions, according to which the bishop had been placed above the presbyter in order to overcome certain special dangers which assaulted the church; a provisional arrangement for the well-being of the church, and not a law for its exist-

[1] *De Unit. Eccles.* cc. 4, 5.

ence; which did not originate with the divine will, but sprang out of human emergencies. Cyprian's influence did not indeed banish from the church this explanation of the origin of the episcopate. It is felt in the writings of Ignatius, it is seen in Tertullian, it may be traced in the Apostolic Constitutions, it was reaffirmed by Jerome and Augustine, reproduced in the writings of Isidore of Seville, kept alive by its retention in the Canon Law, cherished in the monasteries of the Middle Ages, till in the Reformation it was operative in the reconstitution of the Protestant churches. But the principle of Cyprian so far prevailed that from the fourth century ordinations by presbyters alone were forbidden.[1] It became a feature of the organization of the Catholic church, that the presence or approval or co-operation of the bishop was essential to the validity of the rite of ordination. From the fourth century, when it may be regarded as a law universal in its operation,[2] the Catholic church also may be said to have accomplished the task which was begun by Ignatius and attained the end for which it has so long been laboring. Egypt swung into line with the advancing march of the triumphant church. In the case of Ischyras, who lived in the time of Athanasius, as in the earlier difficulties which Origen had encountered, and notwith-

[1] For the 13th canon of the Council of Ancyra, 314 A.D., cf. Hefele, *Konciliengeschichte* (Eng. Trans.), I. 212. The Greek text is χωρεπισκόπους μὴ ἐξεῖναι πρεσβυτέρους ἢ διακόνους χειροτονεῖν, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ πρεσβυτέρους πόλεως, χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπιτραπῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μετὰ γραμμάτων ἐν ἑτέρᾳ παροικίᾳ; and the literal translation: "It is not permitted to the *chorepiscopi* to ordain priests and deacons; neither is this permitted to the priests of the town in other parishes, without the written authority of the bishop of the place." Cf. Routh, *Reliq. Sac.* IV., pp. 144 ff.; also Lightfoot for criticism of Routh's interpretation, in *Essay*, etc., p. 233. In the text of the Canon adopted by Lightfoot, it reads χωρεπισκόποις and μηδὲ πρεσβυτέροις, changes, however, which do not affect the translation as given above. See, for the manuscript readings, Gore, *Christian Ministry*, pp. 370 ff.

[2] "A bishop ought to be constituted by all the bishops that belong to the province; but if this be not practicable, either through pressing necessity or the length of the journey, three must by all means meet; and when they have the consent of those that are absent, signified by letter, then let them perform the consecration; and the ratification of what is done must be allowed in each province to the metropolitan." Nicene Canons, 4 (A.D. 325).

standing the confusion and obscurity in which these incidents are involved, we may read the issue plainly enough, that the Alexandrian church was making its transition to the Catholic order.[1] In the remote islands of the West, where, as in the Scotch-Irish churches, the peculiar arrangement existed by which the bishops lived in monasteries under the control of the abbots, still the law was known and respected that the bishops were responsible for the ordination of presbyters. When Jerome defined the difference between a bishop and a presbyter according to the ecclesiastical law, he reduced the difference to this, — there was nothing which a bishop did which a presbyter could not do except the performance of the function of ordination.[2]

But relics of the older usage still continued, as in the custom by which the bishop addressed the presbyter in writing as his co-presbyter, or in a still more impressive fashion, by which, in the ordination of a presbyter, the bishop does not act alone, but in union with his fellow-presbyters. Although it is customary in ecclesiastical language to speak of the bishop as having the power of

[1] Cf. Excurs, *Katholisch und Römisch*, in Harnack, *Dogmengesch.* I. 400–412: "Die katholische Kirche ist wesentlich das Werk der kleinasiatischen und römischen Kirche. Die alexandrinische Theologie und Kirche schliesst sich erst im 3. Jahrhundert voll an" (p. 403). With the triumph of this ecclesiastical polity, the office of the teacher, which had been proclaimed of divine appointment by St. Paul, practically came to an end in Alexandria, where it existed longer than elsewhere, and with distinguished prestige, as in the cases of Clement and Origen. It shows the distance which the church had travelled in two centuries, that Origen, who in the Apostolic age would have had a place in the higher ministry of the word with Apostles and prophets, was in his own day treated as a layman, obliged it may have been to seek the shelter of the presbyterate in order to continue his work.

[2] *Epis. ad Evangel.* According to the *Canons of Hippolytus*, there is no difference in the form of making a bishop and a presbyter; both are ordained by the same ceremony and by the same prayer; but the bishop differs from the presbyter in possessing the right or power of ordination: "Si autem ordinatur presbyter, omnia cum eo similitur agantur ac cum episcopo, nisi quod cathedrae non insideat. Etiam eadem oratio super eo oretur tota ut super episcopo, cum sola exceptione nominis episcopatus. Episcopus in omnibus rebus aequiparetur presbytero excepto nomine cathedrae et ordinatione, quia potestas ordinandi ipsi non tribuitur." Cf. *Die Canones Hippolyti* by Achelis, in *Texte u. Untersuch.*, vol. 6, vi., p. 61.

ordination, yet in strict parlance it is the bishop's prerogative only when assisted by presbyters. It is doubtful whether an ordination of a presbyter by a bishop alone would possess validity from the point of view of ecclesiastical law. But the bishops alone admit to the diaconate, and consecrate to their own order.[1]

III

The contribution made by Cyprian to the development of ecclesiastical order has been often misunderstood, because it has been taken for granted that the episcopate whose prerogatives he urged and enforced was the later diocesan form, as it existed in the Middle Ages, or as it is found in Germany, France, or England to-day, where a bishop presides over a large territory, in whose diocese may be found hundreds of churches, and as many presbyters who serve them. But in Cyprian's time the episcopate still retained for the most part its original form, where the bishop was simply the pastor of the local church. The presbyters with whom Cyprian came in conflict cor-

[1] Cf. Can. III. of the Council of Carthage, 398 A.D.; also Hatch, Art. *Ordination*, in *Dict. Christ. Antiq.* II. 1519. In the Eastern Ordinals, the presence of the presbyters is required by the ritual, but the bishop alone imposes hands. According to the Western Ordinal, the presbyters lay their hands upon the candidate after the bishop: "Pontifex stans ante faldistorium suum cum mitra et nulla oratione, nulloque cantu praemissis, imponit simul utramque manum super caput cujuslibet ordinandi successive, nihil dicens. Idemque faciunt post eum omnes sacerdotes." So also the Anglican Ordinal, but without specifying whether hands are laid together or in succession. In the ordination of deacons there are also traces of the ancient order, when bishops and deacons were coupled together and mentioned by themselves, as if the deacons stood in some special relation to the bishop but had no relation to the presbyter. The Roman Ordinal is explicit in its statement that the bishop is here to act alone. Beneath the modes of ordination, however, there lies a question about which opinion is widely divergent: Does the essence of ordination consist in the laying on of hands, or in the precise verbal commission? The Anglican and Protestant churches attach a spiritual importance to the laying on of hands, to which the Roman church does not assent. Cf. Preface to the Anglican Ordinal, where its importance is recognized, with the Encyclical of Leo XIII., *Apostolicae Curae* (1896), § 7, where it is said "the imposition of hands by itself signifies nothing definite." But in Acts vi. 3-6, and Acts xiii. 1, 2, it plainly implies the recognition of a call and qualification from the Holy Spirit.

respond in some degree with the assistant ministers who are to be found to-day in the large city church, in which the work is greater than the pastor can perform, but for whose oversight he is responsible. So, at least, it was in North Africa and in Italy and in Asia Minor. But in Cyprian's time, also, a beginning had been made toward the transformation of the office of bishop into its later type of an administrative officer, whose administrative functions are so extensive and absorbing as almost to make impossible any attention to his pastoral office. The germ of this development lay in the episcopate from its origin, but its growth was stimulated by the spirit of Roman institutions and by the constitution of the ancient city. In some of the Protestant churches the spiritual functions of the pastor take the precedence, while the administrative detail is subordinate and may be intrusted to lay helpers. In the ancient church, both bishop and presbyter were originally charged with administrative duties and only gradually and to a limited degree assumed the functions of preaching under the stress of changing circumstances. It is hard, if not in some cases impossible, for an office to change its character, especially in an age like that of Cyprian, where the opportunities of theological education were slight, and the motives weak which should induce the clergy to a long course of preparation for their task. In the case of the presbyter the transformation of his office which, in addition to attesting the tradition, was originally that of pastoral care and discipline, into the modern type of the preacher was rendered possible by his resignation to the bishop of his original function as a defender of the faith which left him free to develop in some other way. But in the case of the bishop, the native bent of his office was not changed, but rather intensified, and forced by the circumstances of history into a further development on the basis of its original character. Meantime, in the age of Cyprian, he was still performing the duties of pastor of the local church, and where the city in which he lived had a large population and Christian congregations multiplied, he

delegated his presbyters to serve them, and the office of bishop grew in consequence in power and dignity.

It was in the greater cities of the Empire, like Rome [1] or Alexandria or Antioch, and more particularly in Rome, that the later type of bishop was first developed. It was natural for the bishops of such cities to assume a tone of higher authority, as if they almost represented a different order from the humble bishop or pastor of some small church in some remote, inaccessible locality. The popular imagination, which counts for so much under such circumstances, ministered to this assumption of a superior dignity. And it was this assumption which Cyprian resisted. Despite his autocratic character and the exclusive privileges which he vindicated for the bishop, he was in reality maintaining the equality in office of the bishop or pastor of the meanest hamlet with the bishop of Rome. He himself was the metropolitan or presiding bishop in his own province of proconsular Africa, but he argued for the weakest and feeblest of his brethren, as having alike with himself received the divine calling, endowed with the equal Apostolic power which came through the grace of orders. Everywhere he saw but one principle of unity for the church, the one bishop or pastor, with whom the faithful must be in communion in order to salvation. The totality of bishops or pastors constituted a solidarity, which was the essence of the church, and a part of this solidarity was held by each bishop or pastor, in the interests of the whole body.[2] To elevate, as we should say, the tone of the clergy, to make these bishop-pastors realize their responsibility, was the aim of Cyprian. In the interest of this conception, he was emboldened to resist the attitude of Rome, which even then was aspiring not merely to precedence, but to authority over the churches.

[1] The growth of the church in Rome, and possibly the number of its congregations, may be inferred from the statement, in Eusebius (*H.E.* vi. 43), that in the middle of the third century it counted forty-six presbyters, seven deacons, etc.

[2] *De Unit.* 5.

The influence of Cyprian in modifying the constitution of the ancient church is to be seen most directly in the method which he urged for the appointment of the bishop or pastor. Before his time, the right of the congregation to appoint its ministers went hand in hand with the doctrine that the ministry was representative of the people, and received its authority by their sanction. According to Cyprian, the authority came not from the congregation or from a ministry which was to be regarded as its representative, but from without, from a clergy which had received its authority from a source external to the people, — an authority or commission which had been handed down from their predecessors in a sacred office, and which could only be imparted by those who possessed it in this long chain of descent. The voice of the people was henceforth restricted to giving information as to the worthiness or unworthiness of those who were candidates for the office.

This separation between clergy and laity, which tended to make the clergy an official caste, was deepened into an impassable barrier by Cyprian's doctrines of the sacerdotal character of the ministry. In the Christian literature of the age which preceded him, there may be traces of a tendency pointing in the direction of that which Cyprian proclaimed, but they are feeble and uncertain. He was the first to proclaim without qualification that the Christian minister, by the authority given in ordination, was a priest, after Jewish or heathen analogies, not only in the sense of representing the congregation before God, but also of representing God and communicating His gifts to the people. There is a sense, indeed, in which the Christian ministry must always appear as having a priestly or mediatorial character, inasmuch as the truth which they proclaim must, in order to be effective, pass through the medium of their personality or be affected by the equation of individual character. But this mediatorial quality pertains also to every Christian man who seeks to influence his brethren. It is a charisma of the Spirit, which is not official in its character, which can neither be

given nor taken away by human authority. It was not in this sense that Cyprian asserted the sacerdotal character of the ministry. Nothing so vague, so indeterminable by ecclesiastical law, would have met his purpose or satisfied the temperament of his mind; and, let us add, perhaps the exigencies of the situation. The Christian ministry, as he conceived it, is a priesthood like the Jewish, differing from it in this only, that if the one has passed away, the other is to endure.[1] The threatenings of the older dispensation are true of the new law, — the man that will not hearken unto the priest shall die. The analogy of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram is invoked as applicable still to those who, in their abandoned mind and sacrilegious daring, question the authority of the Christian priesthood. Such as these are not rejecting the individual, but are defying God.[2] So utterly unhistorical was the mind of Cyprian, that in seeking for evidence to sustain his position, he quoted the words of Christ to the leper that was healed, "Go show thyself to the priest," as indicating the establishment of priesthood as of perpetual divine obligation.[3]

The priesthood, with which Cyprian identified the Christian clergy, must needs also have an altar and somewhat to offer thereon for the people. The suggestion for this offering he found in the bread and wine which the people brought as the material for the Lord's supper. That offering, which the people had hitherto presented in their capacity as a royal priesthood, and which had been consecrated by the pure will, is in Cyprian's teaching the material for another and higher offering to be made by the priest alone. "The bishops or pastors come near to the Lord God, the Holy One, to minister. Purity is demanded of them and unstained character in order that they may holily and worthily offer sacrifices and may be heard in the prayers which they make for the safety of the Lord's people."[4] It is assumed without discussion that the congregation, as individuals or as a whole, is incom-

[1] *Contra Judæos*, 17.
[2] *Epis. ad Cornel.* liv.
[3] *Epis. ad Rogat.* lxiv.
[4] *Epis.* lxvii. 1, 2.

petent or unfit to offer, nor are they competent to appoint their representatives, who offer for them. These are appointed by God, through agencies of His own designation, and in which the congregation has no share. The change seems to have been as complete as it was sudden, which has made it possible for Cyprian to assume such an attitude without the necessity of defending it against resistance. And yet, not many years earlier, Tertullian had written: "Are not also we laity priests? It is written, He hath made us a kingdom of priests to God and His Father. It is the authority of the church which distinguishes between clergy and laity, which has assigned in the congregation a special rank and special seats for the clergy. When there are no clergy, you make the offerings and baptize and are priests solely for yourselves. When three are present, there is a church, although they be laymen. Because you have the power to exercise the functions of a priest when it may be necessary, you should also submit to the discipline to which the priests are subjected."[1] If the laity were no longer conscious, in Cyprian's time, of desire or ability to make for themselves the offering before God, it was well that a body of men should arise who stood ready to offer for them. But from the tone of Cyprian's writings, it is evident that he made no effort to keep alive in the congregation a sense of its duty or privilege. He assumes the obligation of the bishop or pastor to offer and to sacrifice as the inherent and distinctive function of his office, for which God alone has qualified him,[2] through the verbal commission of the episcopate in succession from the Apostles.

[1] *De Exhor. Castit.* c. vii.

[2] Cf. Lightfoot, *Essay on the Christian Ministry*, pp. 242–267, who finds no authority for the sacerdotal conception of the Christian ministry in the New Testament, and regards it as contradicting the general tenor of the Gospel. The first germs of its appearance, which are found at the close of the second century, developed so rapidly that in the age of Cyprian "the plant has all but attained its full growth." Cf. also Harnack, *Dogmengesch.* I., pp. 386,387, on Cyprian's teaching regarding priesthood and sacrifice: "Die klerikale Schriftauslegung mit ihren Schrecklichen Einfallen hat an Cyprian ihren ersten, und zwar sofort einen sehr virtuosen, Vertreter erhalten. . . . Erst in den verhangnissvollen Decennien,

IV

In summing up the work of Cyprian, it may be said that he strengthened the foundations of the Catholic church by formulating those doctrines of Apostolic succession and of a mediating priesthood on which was built the later massive and imposing structure. In his time, also, the word 'Catholic,' as the designation of the church, began to come into more general use, though it was not inserted in the creeds as the object of faith and allegiance until the fourth century. Cyprian's view of Apostolic succession superseded the earlier theory first advocated by Irenæus and in substance adopted by Tertullian, that the Apostles handed down to their successors, whether presbyters or bishops, a teaching received from Christ, and these in turn guaranteed its genuineness and integrity to those that followed them. According to this latter view, adherence to Apostolic teaching is the evidence of a legitimate descent of the ministry from the Apostles. Such is the view which can still be traced in the older church of the East, where a departure from what is held to be the true teaching or tradition is regarded as throwing doubt upon the validity of a ministry. Such, it may be also added, is the view which may be held in Protestant churches, that in adherence to the teaching of the New Testament, the only tradition which comes from Christ, there is a spiritual bond — the most real of all bonds — connecting the ministry, through all the successive gen-

die zwischen der septimianischen und der decianischen Verfolgung liegen, fand dieses statt, und est ist in Abendland wiederum Cyprian, der für uns zuerst die neue Betrachtung und Praxis bezeugt; ist für Cyprian die Vorstellung asketischer Satisfactionen eine ganz geläufige und wird von ihm im Interesse der Katholicität der Kirche ausgebeutet, hat er einen neuen Begriff vom Opfer im Cultus aufgestellt." M. Réville finds the clear statement of the sacerdotal principle in the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, as in the assertion that the ministry possesses a power and authority not derived from the congregation. Cf. *Les Origines de l'Épiscopat*, p. 391: "L'essentiel ici c'est de constater la première apparition de l'idée sacerdotale et d'observer qu'elle a surgi tout d'abord à Rome, avant même la constitution d'un épiscopat monarchique dans cette ville."

erations, with the Master and His disciples. Such a succession as this has not been and cannot be broken. But in Cyprian's time the maintenance of the tradition was no longer the vital issue. The Gnostic vagaries had been overcome, and the Canon of the New Testament had been practically determined; or where doubts remained regarding the right of any book to an admission therein, they were destined to yield or disappear in the following generations. Cyprian's doctrine of Apostolic succession introduced another element, — the perpetuation of a priesthood qualified to sacrifice by a power of verbal commission which was believed to have been given by Christ to His Apostles, and by them handed over to the bishops as their successors. Such a power or commission no man could take unto himself, nor was any spiritual culture, however pure or high, an adequate substitute.

There was in this conception a certain adaptation to the age and to the institutions of the Roman Empire. It found a place in the church for the presbyters, changing their uncertain position into a fixed and definite one, — a priesthood appointed to stand at the altar and offer an acceptable sacrifice to God for the people. The episcopate also rose to higher dignity when it was regarded as the sole repository of the power which enabled a priesthood for its function. There was no question of preaching, for in an administrative system like Cyprian's, preaching was no longer the method by which the church was to be strengthened and consolidated. Nor had presbyter or bishop inherited the traditions of the preacher. But the bishop could qualify the presbyter with the right to offer the sacrifice against all unauthorized intruders. The doctrine that this power had been transmitted from the Apostles through their successors grew in popular favor, nor did it meet with any opposition sufficiently powerful to overcome its adaptability to the needs of the age. The principle of Cyprian that only bishops could ordain became the law of the church, recommended as it was by its analogy with Roman conceptions of the transmission of power, and by its practical value also as a working rule, which subjected

candidates for the ministry to a close surveillance, thus preventing the church from falling into confusion, as would have been the case if presbyters and bishops could have been appointed at the will of irresponsible individuals, or at the instigation of popular factions. As the freedom of the earlier age disappeared, the age of ecclesiastical administration demanded the suppression of the relics of the older time or their relegation into harmless insignificance. Hence that principle of Cyprian's, that only bishops could ordain to the priesthood, or at least that their approval was necessary in case of ordination, together with the rule that the presence of neighboring bishops was necessary when a bishop was to be appointed, this principle remained to become the corner-stone of Catholic administration.

Another feature of the work of Cyprian which survived was his conception of the episcopate as a close corporation. A body of administrative officers is henceforth identified with the Catholic church. They are dignified and ennobled by the theory that the gift of the Holy Spirit is in their exclusive possession. Hence they act together in councils, and their decisions carry the weight of divine revelation. From these councils, presbyters, deacons, and laity were gradually excluded as the high estimate of the bishop's power grew into general acceptance. So far the work of Cyprian prevailed. But his conception of the equality of the bishops, for which he gallantly struggled against the Roman church, did not meet with the same success. Even in his own time there emerged from the ranks of the consolidated episcopate individual bishops who claimed the power of presiding over large jurisdictions, without whose concurrence the local bishop was not authorized to act, except in those instances where ecclesiastical law already had invested him with power. The words of Ignatius, which had been first applied to the local congregations, "Do nothing without the bishop," were now applied to the higher officer, "Let not the bishop do anything without his metropolitan."[1] There may be

[1] Can. ix, *Council of Antioch*, 341 A.D.; Can. xxxiv, *Apos. Can.*

seen in the rise of this hierarchical gradation among the bishops an endeavor to meet a difficulty which Cyprian had not fully contemplated. There must be some check on the bishops themselves, some larger office which with a wider outlook and a broader sympathy could supplement the narrow, isolated range of the local episcopate or neutralize its idiosyncrasies. But the office of bishop, which might have suffered in dignity from the oversight or rigid autocracy of metropolitans, was saved by another tendency which began to operate soon after Cyprian's time, that bishops should no longer be appointed in places where a presbyter could serve as well. The suppression of the smaller bishoprics, as in country villages, or in districts adjacent to cities, by taking from their bishops the power to ordain, kept pace with the growth of the hierarchy, and the reason for the change was plainly alleged: lest the rank of the bishop should suffer in dignity.[1]

But now, also, there were defects in the Cyprianic conception of catholicity, which became more apparent as time went on. Metropolitans of themselves did not constitute a sufficient check upon a body of clergy which had been emancipated from the control of the congregation and

[1] In the sixth of the Sardican Canons (A.D. 343): "It is not allowed to appoint a bishop in a village or small town, where one priest suffices, in order that the episcopal dignity may not suffer; but the bishops of the province shall only appoint one for those places where there have been bishops before. If, however, a town is so populous as to appear worthy of a bishop, it shall obtain one" (Hefele, II. 135). See also the tenth Canon of the Synod of Antioch (A.D. 341). Council of Laodicea (A.D. 343–381, the exact date is unknown, Can. 57: "In villages and in the country no bishops may be appointed but visitors (*περιοδευταί*); and those who are already appointed shall do nothing without the consent of the bishop of the town, as also the priests may do nothing without the consent of the bishop" (Hefele, II. 321).

In the time of Leo the Great, the middle of the fifth century, the process of restricting the episcopate in the interest of its dignity still continued:

"Let not bishops be consecrated in any place nor in any hamlet, nor where they have not been consecrated before; for where the flocks are small and the congregations small the care of the presbyters may suffice, whereas the episcopal authority ought to preside only over larger flocks and more crowded cities lest . . . the position of honor, to which only the more important charges should be given, be held cheap from the very number of those that hold it" (Leonis, *Epis.* xii. 10).

which acknowledged no responsibility to the state. It may be no accidental occurrence that in the later years of Cyprian, there came, under the Emperor Decius, the first great organized persecution, in which a systematic effort was ordered in every part of the Empire for the suppression of the Catholic church. Such a movement on the part of the state followed inevitably the effort to constitute the church an *imperium in imperio*. That Cyprian's attitude toward the state implied not only independence of the church from any subjection to the secular power, but even fostered in the church the tendency toward defiance of the civil authority, may be inferred from his glowing eulogy of Cornelius, the Bishop of Rome, who died about the time of the Decian persecution: "He, intrepid, sat at Rome in the sacerdotal chair at that time when a tyrant, odious to God's priests, was threatening things that can and cannot be spoken, insomuch as he would much more patiently and tolerantly hear that a rival prince was raised up against himself, than that a priest of God was established at Rome."[1]

The conflict between the church and the Empire may have been from the first unavoidable, but the motive in the Decian persecution may be clearly discerned as an apprehension on the part of the state that a foe had arisen which was undermining its power, and was more dangerous to its existence than incursions of the barbarians. The absolute subjection of Christian people to the bishop, to whom he was to stand as the law of every action and the arbitrator and judge in all their differences, whose weapons for defending his authority were superior to those of the state because they involved eternal penalties, — this was a force within the state which disintegrated its integrity, and if it could not be overcome would involve the state in bankruptcy. Cyprian, indeed, did not design his policy with this end in view, but none the less its tendency was towards an usurpation of the functions of the state until the latter had become its subordinate instrument for the execution of its decrees. The growth of

[1] *Epis.* li. Cf. Harnack, *Dogmengesch.* I., p. 380.

Christian morality, the desire for some higher ideal, the inadequacy of the state for the true functions of government, — all these motives were combining to create imperceptibly another organization which should rise upon the ruins of the discredited and bankrupt Empire. From this point of view, the transformation of the Christian ministry into a priesthood by Cyprian is profoundly significant. For priesthoods come when they are needed; they are in waiting for a society which has lost its savor or is no longer capable of exercising or appreciating its freedom. They begin their work beneath the surface with the very fundamentals of discipline, training people to the observance of order and law, to subjection to authority. Such was the lesson which the Empire needed. But it could not let go its authority and prestige without a struggle. How clearly the Roman state saw the issue, was manifested in the method which it pursued for accomplishing the destruction of its rival. Under Valerian (253–260 A.D.), it directed its attention to the bishops as its most dangerous enemies, as well as the mainspring of the church's growth. In the first persecution under Decius, Cyprian had withdrawn from the danger which threatened his life as the head of the community at Carthage. But when the persecution broke out anew, he manfully stood at his post and met his martyrdom like a Christian soldier. Sixtus, also, the Bishop of Rome, likewise became a martyr for that cause of the episcopate, of which, no less than Cyprian, he was a most prominent representative.

There followed another great general persecution, the Diocletian, inspired by the same dread and hatred which had animated the persecutions in Cyprian's time, and again it was demonstrated that the Catholic church was too strong to be suppressed by physical force. But for what followed, in the age of Constantine, one is hardly prepared who has taken Cyprian as the ideal and standard of catholicity. Both state and church reversed their attitude: the Empire accepted Christianity as the state religion, and the bishops bent before the emperor, submitting

to the state as the check upon their authority, which Christian people as such in the congregation could no longer exercise. The significance of this change is so momentous for the fortunes and history of the episcopate that it deserves especial consideration.

Among the qualifications for the office of a bishop, as they were first set forth in the Pastoral Epistles, is the requisition that "he must have a good report among them that are without." This injunction is repeated in the first of the Apostolic Ordinances, with even deeper emphasis. When a small church, which does not have so many as twelve men among its members, is about to provide itself with a bishop, and the neighboring churches have sent three men to assist them in their task, these delegates from the other churches are to examine carefully in the first place whether the candidate "is worthy, that is, if he has a good report among the heathen." As one dwells upon the significance of this requirement, it is seen to involve the question of the relation of the church to the heathen world, to the world of ordinary life and of secular affairs. No such demand could have been made as a suitable or indispensable preparation for the prophetic office or the successful fufilment of the work of the teacher. Indeed, it might have been required as the qualification for the performance of these high spiritual functions, that a man must be expected to incur unpopularity, and even scorn and persecution, as the condition on which he should undertake his office. Otherwise he could not be free to proclaim the divine Word which calls for the condemnation of evil practices, or the enunciation of unwelcome truth in any form, or the proclamation of the doctrine which should seem as foolishness to the heathen mind.

The office, then, of bishop or pastor, in its earliest form, differed from the ordinary pastorate of the modern churches in its conciliatory character and purpose, so that the bishop shall recommend the church and the new religion, to those without as well as within, by the graces and beauties of the spiritual life, which even the heathen must admire. Even if he be not apt to teach by word of mouth, or

be incompetent to expound the Scripture, none the less he will appeal to the world of ordinary men, who have no interest in doctrines or religious controversies, but who judge a religion by its fruits. St. Paul was a teacher and a prophet who threatened to turn the world upside down with the revolutionary doctrines which he proclaimed, and we must admit that for such men, also, the world has need. The truth must be spoken whether men, be they heathen or otherwise, will hear or whether they will forbear. But there is also another way, and of this way the bishop or pastor was to be the representative. The church must adjust itself to the world as it is, before it can succeed in overcoming the world. Accommodation, adaptation, assimilation — these are words which stand for another method of accomplishing some higher result for the kingdom of God. For if the bishop would retain the honor and confidence of those without, he must deal prudently and with moderation in his relation to things which cannot at once be changed; he must be willing to adopt that which is in itself harmless or indifferent in heathen usage; he must not allow himself to become the doctrinaire advocate of some theory, one-sided or radical, which, however powerfully it might recommend itself to a few, would be a stumbling-block to the many. He must make the church grow, recommending it to the unbeliever by holy actions and beneficent fruits, rather than fly in the face of the world and keep the church small. He was not only to be honest and above suspicion as a business man, for he was entrusted with the care of the finances, but he must seek to recommend the cultus over which he presided in ways that the heathen could appreciate. He must adjust himself to the learning of the schools, tolerating the appropriation of heathen wisdom and its fusion with Christian teaching when it contained nothing at variance with the law of Christ. He must adjust the relation of this world to another in no one-sided fashion, but so that the world that now is should be consecrated by a Christian spirit, and not anathematized as an evil order to be done away. And, most impor-

tant of all, he must cultivate some attitude toward the state, some *modus vivendi*, which would make it possible for the church to live and grow in the world, even under secular rulers who did not understand or appreciate its mission. As a man of affairs, he would necessarily have an interest in the well-being of the state, seeking to promote its welfare, upon which also the prosperity of the church depended.

But all this was, as we know, most obnoxious to those in the church, who had inherited and cultivated another attitude, who believed that the destiny of the church was to be forever at war with the existing order, that everything of heathen origin was in its nature evil, that only by keeping the church small could it be kept pure, that heathen learning, science, and art were antagonistic to the cultivation of piety and the spirit of other-worldliness. To those who held this attitude, and who were known in the second century as Montanists, it seemed as though the church had embarked on a dangerous and perilous enterprise, when it removed the prophet and put the catholic bishop in his stead. The secularization of the church was what the Montanist dreaded, and this was the danger involved in the catholic office of the episcopate.

When we compare the spirit of Cyprian with the more genial tone of the catholic episcopate in his own or later ages, it is evident that he was at heart more in sympathy with the Montanists, who disowned the world, than with the catholic spirit, which sought to appropriate whatever might contribute to the growth and extension of the church. Cyprian was the forerunner of that type of the later Protestantism which separates sharply between the state and the church, which advocates some theory in doctrinaire manner of that which ought to be, and refuses to adjust the church to the life of the state. To a certain extent he inspired the Western church with his spirit, and might have been more successful, if he had not been resisted by the bishops of Rome. His attitude in the controversies of his age, in which he contended for strict dealing with those who had lapsed in the perse-

cutions, or the necessity of re-baptism where baptism had been performed by a heretic, or in defective form, indicates that, like a true Montanist, he would keep the church small if he could keep his ideal of its purity. His effort to mingle Montanism and catholicity, retaining the exclusive and more obnoxious features of each position, resulted in a compound which was as impracticable as it was intolerable. He placed the church in an attitude of defiance toward the state; he sought to emancipate the bishops from all control or check upon their procedure. But he could not destroy or wholly neutralize that tendency in the episcopate which made the office a mediating influence between the church and the world. When Constantine held out his hand to the church, the bishops as a body welcomed his advances, they lent him their countenance and aid and sympathy, they easily became officers of the state as well as of the church, and for the most part submitted without reluctance to imperial control. The result of this attitude of the episcopate in the Eastern church was the building up of a great nationality, whose centre was Constantinople, which endured for a thousand years in the midst of such trials and dangers as hardly any other nation was ever content to undergo. But in the Western or Latin church, when the Roman Empire fell in 476, and the bishops lacked the protection of the state, when there was no higher authority to which they were amenable, they fell into bondage to a power with which they had no natural sympathy, but against which they were not competent to struggle, — the absolute authority of the bishops of Rome.[1]

[1] Art. *Cyprianus* in *Dict. Chris. Biog.* by E. C. Benson, late Archbishop of Canterbury; Lightfoot, in *Essay on the Christian Ministry;* Articles on *Ordination* and *Priest*, by Hatch in *Dict. Chris. Antiq.;* also in his *Bampton Lectures*, 1880; lectures v., vi.; Art. *Priester*, in Herzog, *R. E.* Pearson, *Annales Cyprianici;* Dodwell, Dissertationes Cyprianae; Poole, *Life and Times of Cyprian;* Sage, *Principles of the Cyprianic Age*, and *Vindication of Principles*, etc.; Jameson, *C. Isotimus* in reply to Sage; Gervaise, *La Vie de St. Cyprien;* Kayser, *Cyprien ou l'autonomie de l'Épiscopat*, in *Rev. de Théol.* xv.; Huther, *Cyprian's Lehre von der Kirche*, Harnack, in *Dogmengesch.* I.; Rettburg, *Thascius Cäcilius. Cyprianus;* and other monographs by O. Ritschl, Reinkens, Fechtrup.

CHAPTER IX

MONASTICISM[1] IN ITS RELATION TO THE EPISCOPATE AND TO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

I

AMONG the institutions to which Christianity has given birth there is none more important for its vast influence and far-reaching consequences than monasticism. Catholicism, as represented in the episcopate, had reached its full development and was at the height of its power when monasticism arose. It was as if the ocean of spiritual life had been moved to its depths; for the agitation did not at once subside, but wave after wave of monastic influence continued to roll over the church, carrying this peculiar type of Christianity forward into new fields of exertion, and not subsiding until it had accomplished its hidden purpose in the age of the Reformation, after a thousand years had passed away.

As catholicism had developed in the cities of the Empire, so monasticism was a return to the country. Not only had Christianity found its earliest and largest opportunity in

[1] LITERATURE. Harnack, *Das Mönchthum, seine Ideale und seine Geschichte*, 3d ed., 1886; Möhler, *Geschichte des Mönchthums*, 1836; Montalembert, *Les Moines d'Occident depuis St. Bénoît jusqu'à St. Bernard*, 1860; Hélyot, *Histoire des Ordres Monastiques, Religieux et Militaires*, Paris, 1714; Hénrion, *Histoire des Ordres Religieux*, 1835. Articles on Monasticism in Herzog, *R. E.*, by Weingarten, and by Venables in Smith and Cheetham, *Dict. Chris. Antiq.* Also Isaac Taylor's *Ancient Christianity*, Vol. I.; Lecky, *History of European Morals*, Vol. II.; Newman on the Benedictine Order, in *Historical Essays;* the general Church Histories of Neander, Hase, Moeller, Schaff, Fleury, Tillemont, etc. Among the more important SOURCES, Athanasii, *Vita Antonii;* the Greek historians Socrates, Sozomen, Evagrius; Theodoret, *Historia Religiosa;* Jerome, *Vita Pauli*, and of other anchorets; Rufinus, *Historia Eremitica*, Sulpicius Severus, *Dial.* III.; Cassianus, *Instit.* and *Collat.*

towns and cities, but in the city also had the later diocesan episcopacy been developed as the necessary correspondent of the political solidarity for which the civic community stood. But the monks fled from the city as the first condition of attaining their ideal. Solitude was their aim, and the country remote from human society or civilization remained to the last their favorite resort. When civilization threatened to approach them as in their later history in Western Christendom, they emigrated anew in search of some deeper recess in the wilderness. St. Jerome was no ascetic of the stricter sort, as to food, or raiment, or discipline. What he sought for was loneliness, where a man could abide with himself. "Others," he writes, "may think what they like, but to me the town is a prison, and solitude is paradise." In a letter to a young man proposing to become a monk, he says:

"Since you ask me as a brother in what path you should walk, I will be open with you. If you wish to take duty as a presbyter, and are attracted by the work or dignity which falls to the lot of a bishop, live in cities and walled towns, and by so doing turn the salvation of others into the profit of your own soul. But if you desire to be in deed what you are in name, a monk, that is, one who lives alone, what have you to do with cities which are the homes not of solitaries but of crowds? Every mode of life has its own exponents. To come to our own case, let bishops and presbyters take for their examples the Apostles or their companions, and, as they hold the rank which these once held, let them endeavor to exhibit the same excellence. And last of all, let us monks take as the patterns which we are to follow the lives of Paul, of Anthony, of Julian, of Hilarion, of the Macarii. And to go back to the authority of scripture, we have our masters in Elijah and Elisha, and our leaders in the sons of the prophets; who lived in fields and solitary places and made themselves tents by the waters of Jordan. . . . After the freedom of their lonely life they found confinement in a city as bad as imprisonment."[1]

We shall not err, if, in endeavoring to fix the characteristic features of monasticism, we revert to the appearance it presented in the hour of its birth before changes and compromises had modified its external aspect, without, however, overcoming its essential purpose. In the fourth century, the age of Athanasius and Constantine, when

[1] *Epis. ad Paulinum*, lviii. 5.

monasticism came to the birth, it seemed like a veritable stampede from the Catholic church, as though that great creation of Christian energy were no better than the evil world from which escape was sought. For the thousands of men and women also who were then taking their flight from the world practically left the church behind them, carrying with them no bishops, making no provision for ritual or sacrament. To these things they were indifferent, if not averse. Jerome, the most distinguished as well as the most typical representative of early monasticism, the most learned man also of his age, and the most finished scholar, was finally ordained a presbyter; but the ordination was against his will, and he never, it is believed, officiated in the sacraments or rites of the church.[1] He was willing that others associated with him should do so; for himself, he was called to different and, as he felt, higher duties. In a letter to Augustine, he contrasts his own work with that of a bishop, whose function was administration of ecclesiastical affairs, for which he had no aptitude and, it must also be said, no admiration.[2]

We get the keynote of monasticism on its ecclesiastical side in the famous utterance of St. Jerome which was never afterwards forgotten; to the effect that the names 'bishop' and 'presbyter' were used interchangeably in the New Testament, that in the beginning of Christianity the presbyter was the equal of the bishop, and that the bishop was placed above the presbyter because the arrangement was demanded by the exigencies of an evil time. He goes on to remind the bishops that this arrangement was of human origin and not divine, — a circumstance of which the bishops should be aware as well as the presbyters.[3]

[1] Cf. Art. *Hieronymus*, in Smith and Wace, *Dict. Chris. Biog.* His ordination (A.D. 379) was "against his will, and he never consecrated the sacrament or officiated as a presbyter" (III., p. 32).

[2] *Epis.* (112) *ad Augustin.* For a vivid picture of Jerome in his relation to his time, *vide* Thierry, A., *Saint-Jérôme, la société Chrétienne à Rome et l'Emigration Romaine en Terre Sainte*, 1867. Among Jerome's letters which give his ideal of Monasticism, are: *Epis.* (14) *ad Heliod.*, *Epis.* (22) *ad Eustoch.*, *Epis.* (46) *ad Marcell.*, *Epis.* (125) *ad Rustic.*

[3] "Sicut ergo presbyteri sciunt, se ex ecclesiae consuetudine ei, qui sibi praepositus fuerit, esse subjectos, ita episcopi noverint, se magis con-

Whether Jerome was right in this contention is not here the question. The meaning and force of his attitude is not overcome by the detection of any inaccuracy in his assertion regarding the origin of the ministry. That the terms 'presbyter' and 'bishop' were used as synonyms in the New Testament may be disputed without affecting the nature of his statement. He is employing an argument when he seems to be witnessing to historical facts. There is a latent reasoning in his words to the effect that in the normal spiritual order the presbyter in his monastic cell is the equal of the bishop in the great city. He does not antagonize the existing arrangement, but accepts the law of the church which has placed the bishop above the presbyter. He is courteous and reverent to those whom the Catholic church designates as his ecclesiastical superiors. But for himself, he holds his own position to be in the nature of the case the higher one, and only asks that there shall be no interference with his work. He reproves those bishops who seek for popularity or make themselves so obnoxious as to be hated.[1] He reminds them that they are not to regard themselves as lords over God's heritage.[2] But his strongest indignation was called forth by the effort to put the deacons on a footing of equality with the presbyters. This attempt to depreciate the spiritual authority of the presbyter was the occasion of his famous letter to Evangelus,[3] in which he asserted and reiterated and illustrated his position that the presbyters were equal to the bishops; that they were charged by the Apostles with the duty of episcopal supervision; that even the Apostles claimed it as an honor to belong to the presbyterate; and that traces of this original equality were shown at Alexandria, where the presbyters consecrated the bishops, so

suetudine quam dispositionis Dominicae veritatis presbyteris esse majores et in commune debere ecclesiam regere" (*Comm. ad Tit.*, i. 7).

"Apud veteres iidem episcopi et presbyteri fuerunt, quia illud nomen dignitatis est hoc aetatis" (*Epis. ad Oceanum*, lxix. 3).

"Idem est ergo presbyter qui episcopus, et antequam diaboli instinctu studia in religione fierent. . . . Communi presbyterorum consilio ecclesiae gubernabantur" (*Comm. ad Tit.*, i. 7).

[1] *Epis. ad Oceanum*, lxix. 9.

[2] *Epis. ad Theoph.*, lxxxii. 11.

[3] *Epis.* cxlvi.

late as the time of Heraclas (A.D. 233–249) and Dionysius (A.D. 249–265). He qualifies for himself and his companions the duty of obedience, "refusing to serve under compulsion beneath the shadow of Episcopal authority, men whom we do not choose to obey." [1] He regards the service of the tables as inferior to the higher ministry of the Word, which belongs to the bishop and presbyter alike, as if the Gospel never could have contemplated placing the function of administration above the spiritual function of the teacher of the truth. It is, in other words, the familiar argument that while bishops may be necessary to the well-being of a church, they are not necessary to its existence. And such remained the motive of monasticism throughout its history in Western Christendom. It never lost its inner mood of antagonism to the episcopate; its history is a record of conflicts with the bishops, of rivalries and jealousies, of defeats and of victories, till it finally issued in the age of the Reformation, in organized churches which had no bishops, where prophecy or the preaching of the Word was placed above the gift of administration.

In its opposition to the episcopate monasticism is the continuation of that earlier movement known as Montanism, against which the rising Catholic church had struggled in the second century, and in so doing had come to a clearer consciousness of its own character and purpose.[2] Montanism had been subdued, but it was not without a succession of its own. Novatianism, as it was called, was a schism of

[1] *Epis.* lxxxii. 11.

[2] The points of affinity between Montanism and Monasticism, by which the latter is seen as a continuation of the Montanist spirit and purpose, are (1) their common attitude of renunciation of the world; (2) their indifference toward the state; (3) their dislike to the Catholic organization of the church; (4) their maintenance of the principle of direct relationship with God; (5) the tendency of individualism, which makes cultivation of personal piety the supreme aim; (6) the practical adoption by the monks of the reformatory ordinances of Montanism, which they pushed to further extremes; (7) a similar doctrine regarding the nature of the church, which became increasingly manifest in the age of the Reformation; (8) it was in monasteries that preaching was developed, and that prophetism reappeared after its long silence, as in the "Eternal Gospel" or in individual prophets who arose in the later Middle Ages, to protest against the corruption of the church.

the third century which reasserted the fundamental principles of Montanism, its theory of discipline, its doctrine of the church and of its relation to the world, its antagonism to the episcopal régime. If the Novatian schism yielded under the vigorous policy of the Catholic church, it was only to be followed by another movement known as Donatism, which set up in the towns and villages of North Africa a rival church to the Catholic church, resembling it in outward organization, but with an inward motive which points to an antagonism to catholicity, which neither argument nor persuasion, kindness, nor even the force of the state could overcome. The Montanist, the Novatian, the Donatist, were all alike in this respect, that they did not believe that salvation depended on adherence to the Catholic church, that church out of which there was no salvation as Cyprian had maintained, and as Augustine at a later time asserted with equal emphasis. In this conviction monasticism also shared, putting the conviction into practical form, by fleeing to the desert or the cell, in order to cultivate the religious life, and attain reconciliation with God.

An antagonism so deep, so radical, and touching all the relations of life, points to one motive, as the only adequate explanation, — it was the conflict generated between those opposite poles of all human thought and activity, which however hard it may be to define we yet can easily understand, and which have been designated as solidarity and individualism. The Catholic church stood for solidarity, for the subordination of the individual to society or to the fellowship of the church; it stood for unity as the crying need of the world in that age, in opposition to the variations, the divisions, which individualism begets. To the individual calling for that which would meet his special need, asking for inward assurance of pardon, which no external voice or rite could convey, or seeking for a closer walk with God, the Catholic church offered an organization which recognized no inherent differences in men, a common ritual, a common sacrament, where all men as indistinguishable links of a vast chain might find a common or

social salvation. To the soul crying out for God and for direct access to God as the only satisfaction for its deeper distinctive needs, the Catholic church offered the bishops, as the bond of unity, to be acknowledged and obeyed, and, according to the teaching of Ignatius and Cyprian, representatives of God in every community. That the Catholic church had an important mission, which could be accomplished only on the basis of its organization, must be admitted. It was called to minister to a world where humanity was conceived as existing in order to the welfare of the state, where the reverse truth, that the state exists in order to the highest welfare of the individual, had not yet been recognized. It met the Empire on its own ground, binding the peoples together in a higher and stronger solidarity than the state could achieve. The purpose of monasticism was to prepare the way for another conception of man in his social relations, and another doctrine of the church, by which unity should be attained, if at all, by a spiritual fellowship whose bond should be individual faith and love.

The several efforts which had been made to resist the authority of the Catholic episcopate had failed, when in monasticism there came an effort, a spontaneous outburst on so vast a scale, so intense too in its nature, that it could not be overcome, with which the Catholic church was obliged to come to terms. But the Catholic church was now also too strong for any movement of resistance to its authority to hope for absolute success. There resulted a compromise, therefore, between these opposite and almost imcompatible forces. The Catholic church followed the monks with priest and sacrament, they were not to be allowed to escape its authority; but within its fold, and under the limitations of a church within a church, they were at liberty to cultivate the monastic ideal. The compromise could not have been accomplished so easily, if within the church there had not also been a wide reaction against the methods of ecclesiastical authority, and a deep sympathy on the part of those who remained in the church with their brethren who had abandoned its protection. Almost all the great men of the

fourth and fifth centuries, those who had attained any individual development beyond their brethren, were in sympathy with monasticism and even labored to promote its victory. Such were Athanasius, the two Gregories, and Basil, in the East; in the West, Ambrose and Leo and Augustine.

It is only in the Latin church that monasticism can be said to have had a career where it revealed its full content and the possibilities of its endowment, and moved on to the attainment of its hidden purpose. But before turning to the work which it accomplished in Western Christendom, we may dwell for a moment on its record in the Eastern church. The organization of the Catholic church being more complete in the East than in the West, it was from the first more difficult for monasticism to reach there a true and enlarged conception of its function or gain the liberty which its fulfilment demanded. Its rule of life was drawn up by a Catholic bishop, St. Basil of Cæsarea, by whom the monasteries were subjected to episcopal supervision and control; and from the time that the Council of Chalcedon also confirmed the authority of the bishop over monasteries within his jurisdiction, this law became a final arrangement for the whole church of the East. The result may be regarded as the victory of the Catholic church over a movement which was at least indifferent if not hostile to ecclesiastical authority. But this was only part of the compromise. If the bishop was to govern the monasteries, it was fitting that he should be himself a monk, and here monasticism was victorious and weakened the efficiency of the church in the East. The bishops were henceforth to be celibate, educated in the monastery, under the obedience of monastic vows, and called from the monastery to their sees.

In this compromise between catholicism and monasticism, it is evident that the latter had won a real victory, while the triumph of the church in subjecting the monasteries to episcopal control was merely nominal or yielded no valuable results. The bishop from this time lost that character which made him an efficient administrator, who

could mediate between the church and the world, who, as a statesman, could take the large view of religious issues which the nature of the office demanded. The bishops now tended toward a narrow and bitter partisanship, and, influenced by monastic fanaticism, they caught that Montanist spirit of timidity which is always lamenting that the church is in danger. Henceforth, that genial tone which had marked the earlier bishops disappeared; the Montanist tendency which once they had successfully combated, now weakened the whole system. How could men trained in the monastery, and such inchoate imperfect institutions as the Eastern monasteries were, be fitted to govern a church whose mission was in the world and to the world? For no opportunity came to the Eastern monks as to their Western brethren to build up a new civilization. They never in the East went beyond the contemplative conception of the monkish ideal. Henceforth, literature and theology alike declined, the church was marked by a one-sided devotion to ecclesiastical interests, and gradually lost its sympathy with the large human interests which early catholicity had embraced. It may not indeed explain the stagnant condition of the Eastern church that she so unfortunately adjusted her compromise with monasticism, but it is evident that the compromise was of such a nature as to rob both the Catholic church and the monastery of freedom of development, and each tended to neutralize the purpose of the other. From that day to our own there has been but little development, intellectual or spiritual or moral, in the Holy Orthodox church of the East. Only through its close organic relationship with the state, has it been able to retain its dignity and conserve some limited degree of spiritual activity.

When we turn to the Western part of the Empire, the scene is a different one. The system of ecclesiastical organization as it had developed in the East during the fourth and fifth centuries had not been applied in the West, nor had it been possible to extend it there, even if the Councils of the East had sought to do so. For the church had not pervaded Gaul and Spain as it had the countries of Asia

Minor, of Egypt, or Syria, while Germany and England and Scandinavia still remained in the darkness of heathenism. In the East great patriarchs ruled at Constantinople, at Alexandria, at Antioch, and Jerusalem, to whom metropolitans were subjected, and beneath the metropolitan stood the crowded ranks of the ordinary parish episcopate, or the presbyters rising beneath them. But in the West, the metropolitan system had never been completely applied. There was also but one patriarch, the limits of whose diocese were practically whatever he might choose or be able to make them. The Council of Nicæa indeed had defined the jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome, but later councils which had gone on perfecting the ecclesiastical organization in the East had paid but little attention to the West, or, so far as they had legislated at all, had inclined to recognize a certain vague supremacy of the bishop of Rome over the entire West.

If the system of ecclesiastical organization which had been adopted in the Eastern Empire had been extended in the West, there should have been independent patriarchs in North Africa, in Gaul and Spain, in Germany, in England, and in Scandinavia, as well as in Italy. But even had the church in the East contemplated the application of this system in the West, it would have been found impossible because of the legendary requirement that a patriarchal see must have been founded by an Apostle. It was hard enough for Constantinople, a new city built in the fourth century, to fulfil this requirement; but she had claimed St. Andrew as her Apostle, and as she was the capital city of the East, there had been no disposition to scrutinize too rigidly her claim. But in the West it was only too evident that no one of the twelve Apostles could be utilized in this fashion. Gaul did not claim an Apostle as the original founder of her churches, but was content with an Apostolic man, St. Dionysius the Areopagite, who had listened to Apostolic teaching. The British church, which had ceased to have any influence in England after the Anglo-Saxon invasion, pointed to no Apostle as its founder. Spain might have used the name of St. Paul, who had

declared his intention to go there, but there is no tradition in the Spanish church of his visit, and for some reason unexplained, she endeavored to get possession of the body of St. James, whose shrine is now said to be at Compostello. But whatever this tradition may be worth, it was not strong enough to create an Apostolic patriarchal see for Hispania. As for the other countries of the Western Empire, they had yet to be converted. And so, in the popular belief, the only Apostolic see in the West was that of Rome, and she was left to herself to assert and maintain her prestige as she was able or as the divine will in human history enabled her.

When the scene opened in the West, after the barbarian invasion was over, as in the time of Pope Gregory the Great (A.D. 590–604), the episcopate was in a depressed condition, inactive and inefficient. It would not have been possible for Gregory to have called the bishops to order as he did, had the office still maintained itself in its pristine vigor. The cause of the weakness in the Western episcopate was its lack of any centre about which to rally, or to which it might look for support. In the East after the Empire had been divided, the old Catholic vision of a church which knew no distinctions of race or nation had also vanished, and the great patriarchates practically corresponded to national churches. As one by one they fell under Mohammedan sway, only the Greek church remained in its integrity, calling itself Catholic and holding the traditions of the Empire, while in reality a national institution not aspiring to supremacy over Christendom. But in the West the nations had not yet arisen, and the tentative efforts at monarchy were too uncertain in their tenure to form permanent points of attachment for the episcopate. The system of governing the church by means of great synods which might have been a substitute in the West for the patriarchal sees was also an Eastern institution. All the Œcumenical Councils had been held on Eastern soil, and for the most part were attended by Eastern bishops. Even if a General Council had been desired or demanded in the West at this period, there was no recognized author-

ity which could call a council or compel attendance, or pay the expenses which it would involve. The church had yet to be organized in the West, and the only germ for the reorganization, recognized as Apostolic, was the bishop of Rome. Such were the circumstances under which the development of monasticism in the West began.

The peculiar feature of the reorganization of the Western or Latin church which differentiates it from anything known in the church before was the institution of the papacy. From the point of view at which we are now considering it, the papacy was a compromise between those two historic forces, the Catholic or secular side of the church represented by the episcopate, and the more strictly religious side represented by the monastery. As a compromise it was vastly more efficient, as there is hardly need to remark, than the adjustment which the less fortunate church in the East had been driven to adopt. The papacy did not arise until after the barbarian invasion had done its work, and the task began of reconstructing the order of the Western church. The papacy of course claims catholicity as its possession, and even more effectually than the Greek national church with Constantinople at its head; for it has incorporated the word 'Catholic' into its designation as a church, which its Eastern rival has failed to do. There is indeed one sense in which also it seems more catholic than its Eastern rival, in that it refuses to know distinctions of race or nation. Such had been the purpose of the Catholic church when it first appeared, when it was adapting itself to existence in an empire which had abolished national distinctions. But if we regard catholicity as that divine quality in the Christian church which enables it, and indeed forces it, to adapt itself to the changes of time and environment, in order the better to fulfil its mission, then the distinction of catholicity is an imperishable adjunct of Christian faith, the mark of a living church in every age or country, wherever adaptation of the external form to national or race peculiarities, or to the circumstances of the time, gives it new strength for its work of conquering the world for Christ.

The papacy from the time when it first appeared in its living germ as an institution, in the pontificate of Gregory the Great, leaned more to the monastic interpretation of life than to the secular as represented in the episcopate. Gregory himself had been a monk devoted to his monastic calling, and sincerely unwilling to leave his monastery when called to be bishop of Rome. There was thus created an alliance between monasticism and the papacy which continued to increase in strength during all the ages of papal domination. But on the other hand, the papacy was by no means exclusively filled by monks, but great secular bishops, who had no monastic training, were also called to fill the office. Perhaps, on the whole, the monastic side of the papacy has left the deeper impression on the Roman church, as under Gregory the Great, in the hour when the institution was in its plastic mould, and again under Hildebrand, who must always be regarded as the greatest in the long line of Roman pontiffs and the real founder of papal dominion. But great secular administrators were not far behind them, such as Innocent III., who carried the office to its highest dignity and power. In thus mediating between these two aspects of Christianity, represented by the episcopate and the monastery, the papacy fulfilled one of the grandest missions which it has ever been given to any institution to perform. Herein is partly accounted for the vigor and aggressive activity of the Latin church as compared with the church in the East, where the development of both these factors was suddenly arrested, and a decline ensued to which the lapse of time has as yet brought no revival.

II

Monasticism was an integral part of the Mediæval church, so closely related to its life as an organic institution that it may not be possible in every instance to trace its peculiar and special influence. And yet it may also be detached in thought, as if a separate distinct existence within the church, an *ecclesiola in ecclesia*. In this way we detach the papacy,

and study its rise, its decline, and fall. So, also, the episcopate may be traced through the Middle Ages, bearing the marks which it received at its birth in the Apostolic age, while serving an institution by which its own peculiar function was weakened but never lost. The episcopate in the Middle Ages survived the changes and chances of that strange eventful period, when the leading ecclesiastical forces of the time were arrayed against it. It survived and it reappeared at the Reformation in the Church of England and elsewhere, somewhat as it may have appeared in the age of Constantine. What it had accomplished for civilization, what it had stood for in the general relations of the time, will be alluded to hereafter. But in passing, it may be remarked that great as may have been its value or significance, it has never been regarded as one of the creative factors of the Mediæval church. Its rôle seems subordinate, for its opportunity had not yet come. The peculiar factors of the Middle Ages are the Papacy, Monasticism, and Scholasticism. When we turn our attention to monasticism, asking for the purpose which it served, the service which it rendered to civilization and to the intellectual development of Europe no less than to religion, and how it compared in these respects with the episcopate between which and itself there was a state of prevailing hostility, if not active warfare, it needs but a slight acquaintance with the history of the early Middle Ages to recognize that in the conversion of Europe the church was mainly indebted to the zeal and labors of the monks. In the accomplishment of this vast missionary enterprise the initiative appears as coming from the monasteries rather than from the secular clergy or the bishops. Wherever we look in the seventh and eighth centuries, we find the monks engaged in the task of carrying the Gospel to the heathen; swarming in every country, in Gaul and Germany, Switzerland, Friesland, and Scandinavia. Ireland and Scotland led first in the work, two countries in which the organization of the whole church was monastic, rather than secular, where bishops indeed existed, but were passive or inactive, while the church was in reality governed

by the heads of the monasteries. The first missionary incentive to the conversion of England came from the monastery of Monte Casino, where Gregory lived. When he found it impossible to undertake the work himself, he sent other monks in his place, and the results of their mission he followed with paternal care. When the north of England relapsed into heathenism, again it was the monks who came down from Scotland, the land of monasteries, and reconverted Northumbria.

It was an English monk known as St. Boniface (A.D. 680–755) who became the Apostle of Germany. He was inspired to leave his country for his life work abroad by the feeling of gratitude to Rome for having sent Augustine for the conversion of England. In reviewing his influence on his age, it becomes apparent that even the papacy itself owes more to St. Boniface than to any other one source, that without him it could not have extended its sway over Gaul and Germany. It was the supreme object of his life not only to convert the heathen to Christianity, but to hand over the organization of his churches to the control of Rome. He visited Rome and was made a bishop, and labored thenceforth to bring the episcopate into subjection to the Roman see. He himself had been the first bishop to take the oath of allegiance to Rome. With him began the conquest of the episcopate by the papacy. He first organized the fruits of his missionary labors in Germany upon this principle, and then proceeding into Gaul at the invitation of its monarch he initiated the process there by which the episcopate throughout the Frankish monarchy was finally subjected to the authority of Rome. England might have had a different career, and Germany also, if it had not been for the missionary zeal of a monk at Monte Casino, whose solitary dream resulted in such vast consequences for Christendom. We have here the alliance of the papacy with monasticism, as the first step in the rising civilization, the combination by which Europe was not only Christianized, but the early Catholic church was reorganized in its new form. Both institutions, the papacy and the monastery, have a cosmopolitan character, an indifference

to the ties of race and country, which makes them at home among any people and in any land. That the episcopate stood for an indispensable function in this age of new beginnings must be affirmed, but a glance at the names which stand supreme in the missionary annals of the time shows that the motives to missionary enterprise and the accomplishment of the task must be credited to the monastery rather than to the episcopate. St. Severinus († 482), the patron saint for most of Austria, for Vienna and Bavaria; St. Columba, the Apostle of Scotland († 597); St. Aidan of Northumbria; St. Columbanus, the first of Irish missionaries to the Continent († 615); St. Fridolin, the Apostle of the Allemanni; St. Gallus of Switzerland († 640); St. Kilian, the Apostle of Franconia; St. Willibrord († 739), the Apostle of the Frisians; St. Ansgar, the Apostle of the Scandinavians († 865); these are the names of great missionaries, some of whom afterwards became bishops, all of whom derived their missionary zeal from the monasteries. It was a monk also, St. Wilfrid, trained at Lindisfarne and then abbot at Ripon, whose influence told most strongly at the Council of Whitby (A.D. 664), in bringing the early English church into doctrinal and ritual harmony with the church at Rome.

Again, in the intellectual development of Europe, the new incentive came from the monasteries. Learning had taken refuge within their walls at the moment when it was threatened with total extinction by the barbarian invasion. In them was preserved a certain respect for the classical literature, despite the pietistic influence of Pope Gregory the Great, who thought any knowledge unnecessary beyond that of the Bible and the Fathers. The first schools were connected with the monasteries. There were schools connected with the cathedrals at a later time, but the monastic schools took the lead and the scholars of the early Middle Ages were their inmates, a Bede and an Alcuin. In the monasteries of Ireland and Scotland the knowledge of Greek survived when it had perished elsewhere. Thence went forth John Scotus Erigena, not a monk perhaps by profession, but reviving the ancient office of teacher

with no human ordination. The leading theologians who carried on the religious controversies from the time of Charlemagne to Charles the Bald either were monks or had been trained under a monastic influence. That vast system of Mediæval philosophy known as Scholasticism also originated with the monks. In its many phases, it was the monks who stood forth as its exponents, from the time that it took shape with Anselm until it passed over into nominalism under Occam. At one time nearly all the professors at Paris, the great theological centre, were mendicant monks. When thought first became sceptical, the monk Abelard was its spokesman; when it became conservative and reached the height of its peculiar development and influence, two monks arose, Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus, who are admitted by universal consent to stand on equal footing with the world's great thinkers. In a word, the intellectual life of the Middle Ages was almost the peculiar appropriation of the monastery.

Or if we turn to the religious life, and the culture of piety, the greatest saints are ranked among the monks. Where shall we find in any age of the church a man who commands our admiration for such saintly devotion and purity, such simplicity of faith, as the Venerable Bede, who declined the office of bishop, and preferred to be a layman and a monk? Bede, and St. Martin of Tours, St. Bernard, St. Anselm, St. Bonaventura, St. Thomas of Aquinas, and St. Francis of Assisi, — these may be only the greatest among many who were great in faith and in love and in good works, so great that they belong in the calendar of the universal church, so great in their spiritual attainment that they reflect honor upon the race. And when Scholasticism fell into decline in the fourteenth century, when the Christian mind was confused by the double standard which Occam had set up, it was monks who came to the rescue, who developed the content of faith as contrasted with the reason, Eckhart and Tauler, the founders of that higher type of Mysticism which prepared the way for Thomas à Kempis, Savonarola, and the Reformers before the Reformation.

There are other aspects of monasticism in its relation to

civilization which are equally important, but to which only a word can be given in passing. In the most direct way the monks labored to civilize that barbarous age, when they came forth to assume the lead, by ploughing and sowing, mowing and reaping, hewing down the forests, laying the foundations of towns and cities, teaching the people the dignity and sacredness of labor as well as the methods of agriculture, and all this combined with the teaching of religion and the practice of charity. Montalembert, who wrote a panegyric upon monasticism in his *History of the Monks of the West*, remarks that the English bishoprics were cradled in the monastery. But it almost seems as if Western civilization itself were also cradled in the monastery, in that view of life and of the world, which, having gained the meaning of the spiritual by renouncing the world, returns to the world again in order to rebuild the temporal and secular on the foundation and in the interests of the spiritual. In all this there is something most extraordinary, and at a first glance almost inexplicable. Such is the feeling of the traveller who pauses for a moment to gaze at the ruins which the monks have left behind them. He is impressed with the vastness of the labors they accomplished; he sees the traces of great powers of administration; he bows in reverence before the beauty of their work in architecture and in art; but he also wonders why they should have lived as they did; it seems to him a thing so remote from modern life that he is content to wonder and make no effort to explain.

The difficulty in accounting for Western monasticism lies partly in the stupendous contradiction which the system involves between its early motives and history, as we first make their acquaintance in the ancient church, and the results accomplished in the Middle Ages, which seem at every point to reverse these motives and to falsify the early attitude. In the age when they arose in the fourth and fifth centuries, the monks appear as fleeing not only from the world with a contempt for its honors, but from the Catholic church as well; they had so little interest in the well-being of the state that they regarded its downfall with

indifference; and not only are they charged with want of patriotism, but even with assisting the foes of the state in working its destruction. At that time also, they were iconoclasts, almost inhuman in their hatred of the heathens, in the fanaticism with which they broke down heathen temples and architectural monuments. They were the stalwart opponents of heresy; with a vindictive devotion to anthropomorphic conceptions of God, they forced the bishops into bitter and angry controversies over differences of doctrine. It was they who did most to overcome and banish from the church that higher type of Christian theology represented by Origen; they despised heathen philosophy and are implicated in the murder of one of its famous teachers; they turned away in disgust and aversion from classical literature and all intellectual pursuits; they aimed at an inactive life in order to the practice of contemplation as their highest duty; they were indifferent to the extension of the church or the salvation of society, and were preoccupied with the salvation of their own individual souls.

And in the Middle Ages all this was reversed. They struck an alliance with the papacy, helping to develop a type of ecclesiasticism whose authority over the conscience was more rigid than the Catholic rule from which they fled. From having been despisers of the order of this world, they aspired to become its conquerors and sovereigns. They became the pioneers of civilization; they cultivated literature and philosophy, till they became the intellectual teachers and leaders of the world. They became involved in affairs to such an extent that great abbots and priors were men of large executive capacity and gave the models of administration for great institutions. They rejected wealth, and yet vast revenues were at their disposal, so that, when the moment was ripe, they were able to give the first impetus to ecclesiastical architecture and art, and in their devotion to art they have made the modern world their debtors. In one thing alone were they consistent, — they labored to secure the knowledge and to cultivate the sense of immediate and personal relation to God, in order to the attainment of salvation.

III

The secret of this strange history is after all a simple one, — the motive which we know as individualism, in contrast and in opposition to solidarity. The Catholic church had aimed to solidify the church and the world in unity, and it had begun to appear as if its purpose were already achieved, when the monks arose to dispute its ideal, to assert the importance of the individual man as greater than the institution, as greater than any temple which man could build, or wherein he might worship. The influence of individualism, as a superior motive of life, seemed to have been suppressed and well-nigh extinguished when the strange phenomenon of monasticism appeared, the harbinger of a vast reaction, in reality the first faint beginning of a new age. From the Catholic episcopate which stood in its way, it either emancipated itself, or else labored to subordinate it to a higher power, which, like the papacy, should be in sympathy with its own aim. It may be said of monasticism, in the modern phrase, that during the Middle Ages it held the balance of power, and while it was still a living force, used both the episcopate and the papacy for the accomplishment of its ends.

Individualism may be considered as the highest and rarest product of human development. It does not come first in the order of time, but slowly emerges from that situation in which humanity appears as a solid mass, in which one man does not differ greatly from another, and where the interest of the individual is subordinated to the good of the whole. It is that potential quality which distinguishes humanity from the lower grades of the animal creation. In the lower forms of civilization, it can hardly be said to exist, but betrays its possibility in the rudest germ, such as an overpowering selfishness. Solidarity comes first in the historical and natural order, making possible the political forms of the tribe or the nation, where all may act together as one man in self-defence or for mutual support. When solidarity receives its highest stamp as under Christian development, it becomes the brotherhood and fellowship

of human souls bound together by the tie of love, which is both human and divine. But wherever a solidarity has been established before individuality has had a chance to develop its inherent quality, as was the case in the Roman Empire, or the Catholic church of the early centuries, there external force in some of its many varieties becomes the bond of unity rather than the charity, which is of slow growth and must needs be first secured in individual souls.

The roots of individualism in humanity lie in the circumstances of birth and death, — that we come into the world alone, and when we die we must go forth alone into the vastness of infinite space. We may escape the fears or the inferences which these facts suggest by denying the possibility of a future life or by dwelling in the mass of humanity as indistinguishable atoms, until the sense of individual responsibility grows weaker and ceases to trouble us. But the Gospel of Christ places the emphasis on immortality beyond any other religion, and it also asserts the need of an individual and inward preparation or purification in order to secure its blessed results. The Gospel everywhere individualizes men as if one single human soul were valuable enough in the eyes of God to account for Calvary, as if Christ would have died to save one solitary individual man. So far as nature is concerned, the individual counts for nothing, it is the species or genus which is everything. Thus Tennyson wrote of nature:

> "So careful of the type she seems,
> So careless of the single life."

But when we rise above nature into the sphere of humanity, the law of nature seems to be reversed and the law of the spirit asserts its claim. "With man so far as he is an object of interest," said the late Mr. Froude, "it is the type which is nothing, the individual which is everything. Take away from Ulysses or Hamlet their personal individuality and leave only what belongs to the race, would you say that you had preserved the immortal part and thrown away the unimportant? The immortal part of a man is not that

which he shares with the rest of his race, but that which he possesses of his own." Perhaps it would be more true to say that it is the humanity itself that is revealed and made a secure possession in the higher stages of individual development. The two are organically related, the race and the individual, but the latter is the immediate goal for which humanity itself may be said to labor. Hence humanity itself prizes the result of individual achievement as if its highest product, its flower and crown, a prophecy also of the ultimate redemption of the race.

When the monastic movement began, there was but little scope for the development of individualism within the Catholic church. In every direction in which a man might turn for an opportunity to develop his capacities and to manifest his purpose, the approaches were blocked by the powerful organization whose prestige must also intimidate the soul. Freedom of thought, freedom of inquiry in theology, which was the only science, had been discouraged if not prohibited by the later growth of tradition. To seek for new truth was as absurd as it was impossible; for all truth, it was believed, had been given in fixed and final form by the Apostles, of which the episcopate was regarded as the curator and depositary. Under these circumstances, the rising spirit of individualism was driven into strange and devious ways for the utterance or unfolding of the deeper impulses of the human soul. Something at least could be done by way of protest if nothing more. In the three monastic vows of poverty, celibacy, and obedience, we have the external symbols of the movement. They were not originated by the Christian instinct; they had served for ages as the mould in which the spirit of the individual man might be recast when seeking possibilities of escape from the tyranny of conventional religion, or of a world which had grown indifferent to spiritual realities. In taking the vows of poverty and celibacy, the monk flung defiance in the face of the existing civilization, flouting the relationships of the state and the family as ties incompatible with the highest freedom and development. But he also took a vow of obedience, seeking therein a further

freedom; for the obedience was to be rendered to one like himself, in sympathy with his purpose and method. To these vows there was added, in the Benedictine order, a restriction which tied the monk to his domicile (*stabilitas loci*), a necessary restriction in order to overcome the habit of wandering generated in the barbarian invasion. With these distinctive features, monasticism came into conflict with the Catholic church, and in the rivalry and the struggle which followed was laid the foundation for the higher civilization of Christendom.

IV

In studying the institutions of the Middle Ages, the attention is apt to be fastened upon its more striking situations, such as the conflicts between popes and emperors, on which the development of the political and social order seems to hinge, those conflicts between church and state, which issued in the civil supremacy of the papacy. But there were other conflicts, whose inward working is more obscure and where results are less striking, those struggles of which it is sometimes hard to see any direct result, but whose issue was the spiritual advance of humanity. From the beginning of the Middle Ages, we may discern traces of the antagonism between two types of Christianity, represented on the one hand by that early Catholic church, of which the episcopate was the representative, and on the other by monasticism, whose indirect aim is revealed by its final outcome, — a conception of the church in harmony with its essential principle.

Monasticism had been in its origin essentially a movement of the laity as such, in contrast to the clergy, nor had it sought or desired for its members admission into the clerical order. Its principle had been the spiritual priesthood of the Christian man as something higher and more vitally related to the salvation of the soul than the ecclesiastical priesthood. But when the work of converting Western Europe devolved so extensively upon the monastery, the monks were obliged to receive ordination from the

bishops for the administration of ecclesiastical rites, until they finally came by their very profession as monks to be enrolled in the ranks of the priesthood. Among other motives which contributed to this result, much was probably owing to the popular judgment, which attributed to them a clerical rank and function or demanded it of them. Enrolment among the clergy thus seemed like a victory of the Catholic order by which the monks were brought into close relation to the bishops and under obligation to fulfil the canonical obedience due from the clergy to episcopal authority. But the earlier Middle Ages, from the seventh to the tenth centuries, reveal also on the part of the monasteries a decided unwillingness to accept the common construction of such relationship. The vow of obedience to the head of the monastery was superseding the vow of obedience to the bishops or making it superfluous. Throughout this whole period the struggle went on between the bishops who were seeking, often with the support of the state, to subject the monasteries to their supervision and control, and the monks who sought to escape from this control. In this struggle the sympathy of the papacy was for the most part given to the cause of the monasteries. The records of the time abound in instances of hostility between the two institutions; the bishops were accused of plundering monasteries or appropriating their revenues; episcopal rights of visitation were increasingly limited, and bishops were commanded to give ordination when requested without compensation.[1] It was surely an anomalous situation. It was hard for the monks to serve two masters, one in the world and from the monastic point of mind living for the world; and the other not of the world, — the abbot to whom he was bound by a special vow of obedience. So

[1] Cf. *Concil. Tolet.* Can. 51, in Mansi, X., where the bishops are condemned for treating the monks like slaves, and for regarding the monasteries as if their own property; also Art. *Theodore of Tarsus*, in Smith and Wace, *Dic. Chris. Biog.*, for a similar situation in England in the seventh century, where the monastic establishments are seen withdrawing themselves from the superintendence of the bishops and gaining their independence; also Laurent, *Études sur l'Histoire de l'Humanité*, V., pp. 292 ff.

also was it incongruous for the bishop to see a large number of his clergy in monasteries not subject to his control. But the aggressive policy of the bishops ended in failure. The great monastery of Clugny, founded in the tenth century, was emancipated from episcopal authority and placed in immediate subjection to the pope; and from this time the new orders of monks to which the later Middle Ages gave rise in such rich variety were with few exceptions emancipated from episcopal control. Not only so, but the greater abbots now aspired successfully to rival the bishops in dignity and authority: they received from the pope the right to wear the episcopal mitre, they took their seats in the councils of princes or in the ecclesiastical synods, dividing with the bishops the power within the church and the reverence of the people. One thing only they did not attain, — the right to confer ordination, which was still regarded, according to ancient canon law, as the peculiar function of the episcopate.

If we may regard the entrance of the monks into the clerical estate as a victory of the episcopate over monasticism by which the latter lost something of its original character, on the other hand, the next stage in this rivalry resulted in the triumph of monasticism, by which bishops and clergy of all degrees were compelled to submit to the monastic vow of celibacy. It was in the monastery of Clugny, which by its constitution was the first to be exempted from episcopal authority, that the purpose was nourished which demanded the universal obligation on the clergy of the monastic ideal.[1] In the Eastern church, as has been remarked, a compromise had been effected by which the bishops were to be monks trained in the monas-

[1] The organization of the monastery of Clugny, free from episcopal supervision and under the direct control of the papacy, was not the only innovation which Clugny made in the history of monasticism. Of almost equal significance was the change which it initiated, of affiliating its houses as they arose in one great congregation, in contrast with the Benedictine method, where each monastery was independent. Thus monasticism went through a progressive development: (1) The solitary monk or hermit, — the anchoretic type; (2) The community, independent of other communities; (3) The affiliation of communities in one organic cosmopolitan organization.

teries, while the lower clergy were allowed to marry. No such compromise was possible in Western Europe, much less was it desirable. The life and purpose of the church in the West were stimulated by the conflict in which each party sought the victory. When the monks had entered the order of priesthood, it seemed incongruous that some of the clergy should be bound to celibacy, which was by common consent the highest spiritual state, while others, admitting the ideal, should accept a lower standard. When the movement began whose aim was to enforce celibacy upon all the clergy, it was foredoomed to success. Already had the bishops and clergy been subjected to papal authority by monastic influence, as when Boniface, the Apostle of Germany, first took the vow of papal obedience for himself and then organized the church in Germany and in France in harmony with this principle. Again it was a monk, educated at Clugny, rising to the papal chair as Gregory VII., who enforced the obligation to celibacy, which has ever since remained binding upon the Roman clergy. Hildebrand may have been moved by other reasons than the desire to extend the monastic ideal. It was evident enough that the church would be stronger to carry on the war with the state which Hildebrand was about to declare, if the clergy were emancipated from those secular ties like marriage which bound them in their interests to dependence upon the secular power.

But in this effort to enforce celibacy upon the secular clergy, we may see more clearly than at any other juncture in Mediæval history, how close and essential was the alliance of the papacy with the monastic purpose. Hildebrand at first resorted to the bishops for aid in carrying out his decree; but the episcopate almost as a body appeared as unwilling instruments of his power. The inhumanity of the papal attitude, the widespread anguish and suffering which ensued, — to all this the bishops could not or would not give their sanction. When the papacy failed in its appeal to the bishops to enforce the decree against marriage of the clergy, it turned to the monks and renewed its ancient alliance. Papal autocracy was now

reasserted, as the inmost principle of the Catholic church. The bishops were reminded by Hildebrand that the monasteries had been set free from episcopal control, and the bishops also exempted from the power of metropolitans in order to their more immediate connection with the Apostolical see of Rome. The monks responded to this appeal, travelling over the country in order to denounce and overcome the vicious lives of the secular clergy. But the final appeal of Hildebrand was to the laity, who were urged to withdraw from communion with those secular clergy who were refusing obedience to the papal decree, since they were polluting the sacraments and their blessing would be turned to a malediction. Hildebrand was charged with teaching the Donatist theory that an evil life in the clergy vitiated their sacramental acts. He did not, indeed, in so many words, commit himself to this view, which was at a later time to become the principle of Wycliffe and Huss, of the Waldensians and other sects, a lever for breaking down the authority of the Mediæval church. Hildebrand stood rather upon the principle of obedience to papal authority as so vital, that any cleric who refused it separated himself from the church. It is difficult, however, to see wherein Hildebrand's theory differs from the ancient Donatism, against which the Catholic church had protested in the fourth century. But there can be no doubt that the laity to whom Hildebrand appealed, understood his meaning in the Donatist sense; they rose up in wrath against the secular clergy; and from this time we begin to note the rise of heretical sects, who declaimed against the vices of the clergy, who went even further, as in the inference which they drew that sacraments and rites were unnecessary. Hildebrand disturbed the peace of the church; but his immediate aim was accomplished, celibacy was enforced, monasticism had now won its greatest victory, and the Donatist theory of the church had been the tacit assumption by means of which the victory had been achieved. That theory meant, what Montanists and also Novatians had taught, that it is the congregation of faithful men, whose individual faith and holiness confer sanc-

tity upon the organization, and not primarily the holiness of the church, which is imputed to the clergy or to individual members, as had been the teaching of Cyprian.[1]

V

The most flourishing period of monasticism is also the age of the domination of the Latin church. From the tenth century to the fourteenth the monasteries were still growing, putting forth new shoots, each new monastic creation differing in some vital points, or aiming at the common purpose by some new method, some more stringent effort to accomplish its ideal. In this respect, the monasticism of this age finds its parallel in the vigor and variety of the Protestant sects in the age of the Reformation and the three centuries which have since elapsed. During this period also, as in the early Middle Ages, while the episcopate was performing a great task, which was of high service to the later development of political institutions, yet it shows no special development within the church, winning no trophies, giving no apparent evidence of aroused activity. It had practically been shut off from aggressive work, or from any powerful assertion of its own peculiar motive by the league between the papacy and monasticism. The episcopate had been beguiled, if we may use the expression, by the opportunity held out to it in the Forged Decretals of Isidore, of escaping the infelicities of secular control, but only to fall bound hand and foot by a worse enemy. Any aspirations of the episcopate for independence had been further checked by the appointment of two or more metropolitans in every country, which served as courts of appeals, so that no one bishop could stand forth as primate

[1] Cf. Neander, *Ch. His.*, VII., pp. 125–137 (Bohn. ed.) for a clear statement of the issues raised by Hildebrand; also Lea, H. C., *Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church*, pp. 238–249. In his argument against the Donatists, Augustine had maintained as the Catholic principle that Christ might operate through the sacraments, however unworthy might be their administrator, *Contr. Petilian*, I., c. 8. For an admirable discussion of the controversy with the Donatists, cf. Neander, III. 258–308. For the heretical sects which rose immediately after Hildebrand's time, cf. Moeller, II. 382–390.

in his own country and lead any movement of ecclesiastical revolt. Under monkish activity, the episcopate had lost the credit of converting Europe, and also the benefit which would have resulted to it from such spiritual self-sacrifice. In every direction its powers were limited, and the original theory of the office modified by the practical needs of the church. Not only from the time of Hildebrand's reign were the monks exempt from the supervision of the bishops, but even in cathedral churches a similar movement went on by which the secular clergy, the dean and canons, were set free from the bishop's authority. And in a word, the episcopal office which had claimed to hold directly from God its origin and authority, was now qualified as coming by the grace of God and the grace of the Apostolic See.[1]

The life and vigor of monasticism in this period were not only manifested in the extension of its power by which it limited the episcopate, or captured the field of missions, or took possession of the universities and became the leader of the intellectual life, but in another direction it sought to extend itself by colonizing its principles. For any movement which is truly alive must grow and expand, and have an adequate field for its extension. This field of invasion monasticism found in the secular side of the church, represented by the episcopate. After it had won its great victory in the imposition of the monastic vow of celibacy upon bishops and clergy, it aimed to extend the application of another monastic vow, that of poverty, until it should become the rule of the secular church. The rise of St. Bernard in the twelfth century († 1153) marks the increasing tendency to attach importance to poverty, as somehow essential to the highest spiritual life. Arnold

[1] In his work on the *Growth of Church Institutions*, Dr. Hatch has traced the process in the secular church under episcopal control, by which the parish priest came to have a tenure of office which was not dependent on the bishop, as the Ignatian and Cyprianic theories of the episcopate had originally required. So also the city clergy, and deans, canons, and prebendaries came to be independent of the bishop. The further influence of the monastery on the secular church was seen in the establishment of clergy houses for the secular clergy, by which the majority of them were compelled to live according to a common rule of life. Cf. pp. 51–56, and pp. 157–172.

of Brescia († 1155), to whom Bernard was no friend, was only applying the teaching of Bernard when he called upon the hierarchy, the bishops, and clergy to forsake their property, and embrace the evangelical ideal. Joachim of Floris († 1201), whose name is associated with the *Eternal Gospel*, anticipated that when the age of the Holy Spirit should begin, the church would be purified by the labors of the monks and the ideal of monasticism become universal.

All through the twelfth century the idea was taking deeper root that poverty was Apostolic in its origin and sanction. Heretical sects combined with reformers and prophets in demanding its recognition. At last came the Mendicant orders, and more particularly the Franciscan, whose foundations were sunk more deeply in this subsoil of poverty. The Benedictine order and the monastic congregations of the eleventh and twelfth centuries had interpreted the vow of poverty as pertaining only to the individual monk, while the order itself to which he belonged was at liberty to hold property without any limit. St. Francis had thought to get rid of the laxity and corruption which this corporate possession of wealth entailed, by prohibiting the monasteries of his order from holding property or even enjoying its use. So at least he was interpreted by the stricter observants of his rule. With these two orders, the Dominican and the Franciscan, monasticism culminated, taking on the form and the reality of cosmopolitan institutions within the Mediæval church. Not only were they exempted from episcopal control, but they were allowed by the papacy to usurp the functions of the secular clergy, to take charge of parishes, to hear confessions and give absolution in the churches of Christendom wherever their services might be desired. And the testimony of the time indicates that the friars or mendicant monks were everywhere acceptable to the people, more so than the parish clergy. It was a great object lesson, which the people were not slow in reading, the vision of those who had forsaken all things for the following of Christ. Very close also was the alliance between the papacy and the mendicant monks. Domini-

cans and Franciscans were its body-guard, carrying its authority and its presence into every part of Christendom.

On the whole, it may be said that from the time of the first close association of the papacy with monasticism under the pontificate of Gregory the Great, its career had been marked by a constant development, and its persistent rivalry and conflict with the secular church had been crowned with success. But at last a check was placed upon its growth by the very authority which had ministered to its extension and power, and from that time the movement ceased to put forth new offshoots, or to pursue with any success its persistent ideal. But when monasticism declined, its patron and support, the papacy, declined also, and both lost their hold upon the new world that was arising. They rose together and came into the church together, and when their work was done, together they took their departure. It was in the year 1321, while the papacy was living in its voluntary captivity at Avignon, that the crisis came, whose full meaning was not at the time discerned, but which now appears not only as the dissolution of the partnership between the papacy and monasticism as living forces, but as the death-blow to monastic aspiration on the one hand, and on the other the revelation of the spiritual incapacity of the papacy for its high office of universal mediation. The crisis had been long in coming, and more than once when it had been imminent, it was postponed or evaded. Soon after the death of St. Francis in 1226, a division among his adherents in regard to the possession of property led to violent contention within the order. The laxer party maintained that while the order could not hold property which it could call its own, it might be entitled to the benefit or usufruct of property, which was to be regarded as given not to the order, but to the Roman church for the benefit of the order. Such was the interpretation sanctioned by Pope Nicholas III. (1279) in a bull which declared that the usufruct of earthly goods, though not their possession, had been permitted by the example of Christ and the Apostles. The decision was followed by a schism in the order, the

brethren of the stricter observance forming an independent community of their own. Even at this time there were rigorists who took up an attitude of opposition to the papacy and henceforth disowned it as anti-Christ. But the final issue was postponed for another generation.

In 1321 the question took such shape that it could not be evaded. The Dominicans in that year, who had already practically discarded the mendicant principle, became aware that the Franciscans had formulated their motive in the dogmatic statement that neither as individuals nor as a society had Christ or His Apostles been in possession of property. When the Dominicans disputed this principle, the Franciscans affirmed its orthodoxy, and the order as a whole in 1322 gave its approval. The case was now carried to the pope, John XXII., living in wealth and luxury at Avignon. It was a case which demanded an answer without delay, and without equivocation: and the decision was promptly rendered and thoroughly enforced in a series of five successive utterances from the pope, in which the proposition was declared erroneous, that neither Christ nor His Apostles, either singly or collectively, had been holders of property. Looking at the question and its decision from the point of view of the age, the two sides of the church, secular and religious, the two component elements of Mediæval Christianity which had been in conflict for centuries, now met on their last battle-field, and the secular was victorious. The papacy had deserted its old ally, had made no effort to compromise or neutralize its utterance, but repeatedly and unequivocally had condemned the principle for which St. Francis stood, with which a man like Occam, the leading mind of his age, was also in sympathy. No disaster followed the decision, no schism, or other evidence that the peace of the church had been broken. Occam and others like-minded left Avignon and betook themselves to the Emperor Louis of Bavaria, preferring and defending his cause against the pope. For the rest of the century that followed, the Franciscans of the stricter sort, who could not be reconciled to the pope's decision, are found in association with heretical

orders, strange and weird associations, which have only one element in common, — a certain unrest and dissatisfaction, a desire for some higher rule of life. Such were the Spirituals, the Fraticelli, the Friends of God, the Apostolici, monks who could no longer pursue their calling in the monastery, for the sanction of Christ and His Apostles had been refused to their ideal. The last aspiration of the monastic purpose, to identify itself with Christ and His disciples, had failed; the world refused to regard poverty as the true life of man on the earth. A limit had been set, which hindered the highest monastic ideal from expanding into universal application.

But from our own point of view an ideal so hopelessly impossible indicates that monasticism must have already exhausted its interior force, that its mission to the world was over. From this time it gave increasing evidence, in the moral corruption into which it sank, that its work was done. Had it been upheld by any living motive, it could not have fallen so low, in the fourteenth century, as the reiterated charges against it seem to demonstrate. But enough has been said on this point by many writers who have pointed out the depth and the extent of the corruption which now invaded the monasteries in every country of Europe. These charges may be exaggerated, undoubtedly they are; but making every allowance, the accusations of vice, of luxury and gluttony, of laziness and ignorance, it is impossible to overcome. They were made in the first instance by the friends of the monasteries, in the hope of their purification. But the efforts of two centuries to restore them to their old efficiency were in vain. They were suppressed at last, by Henry VIII. in England with hardly a protest or a murmur, and with the approval of the people, which not only made possible, but justified, the act of the king.

Nor since that day has monasticism had any career in the Christian church. More and more have its opportunities been restricted, its houses closed, its revenues appropriated by the state. In our own age we have seen Italy and France, Germany and Mexico, carrying on the work

begun at the Reformation of suppressing monastic establishments.[1] No great names of world-wide significance, and but few in the lesser ranks of fame, are connected any longer with the monastery. Henceforth they do not serve as retreats for souls inspired with some lofty purpose or dream, in literature, or art, or science, in the cause of philosophy or theology, but so far as they may be said to live at all, they are recruited by those who have no special mission to the world; those who have been disillusioned by the experiences of life may still resort to them, but they take with them no hope or heart as in the ancient days. Once again, indeed, it is true, an effort was made with intense purpose and devotion to bring monasticism to the aid of the papacy in the hour of its great distress and weakness. No more chivalrous soul ever lived than Ignatius Loyola, nor any mind more keen ever came to the rescue of the Mediæval church. He was wise enough to discover that, in the founding of a new order, the only monastic principle which yet remained to be exploited was the vow of obedience. That vow was now stretched till it included the intellect and the imagination as well as the conscience, shutting out the last motive or opportunity for individual exertion. It is not celibacy, it is not poverty, which, according to Ignatius, makes the highest saint, but obedience so unhesitating and so complete as to annihilate all spontaneous individual activity, and so, in the long run, to defeat the purpose which it seeks to maintain. With the rise of the Jesuit order, the history of monasticism may be said to have come to an end.

The great purposes which the monastery had served during the Middle Ages could be henceforth attained in

[1] "The total number of monasteries so suppressed in Italy down to the close of 1882 was 2255, involving an enormous displacement of property and dispersion of inmates. And yet there is some reason to think that the state did but do roughly and harshly what the church should have done more gradually and wisely; for the judgment passed on the dissolution by Pius IX. himself, in speaking to an English R. C. bishop, was: 'It was the devil's work; but the good God will turn it into a blessing, since their destruction was the only reform possible to them'" (*Encyc. Brit.*, XVI., p. 715).

other and better ways. They had been retreats to which the individual man could betake himself, who could find no mission in the world. They had cultivated individualism when the prevailing tendency in the church was toward an irresponsible solidarity; they had presented object lessons to the world, of the highest value, as to the worth of simple manhood, when seen apart from all relationship which might weaken its dignity or disguise its strength. But now the times were changing rapidly from the fourteenth century. Great personalities were wanted in the world, and there was no longer a necessity for their leaving it. The opportunities for the individual were increasing in every direction, and individual aspirations could be cultivated in the world far better than in the monastery. The most that the monastery had done or could do was to nourish the germ of individualism, to keep it from perishing from off the face of the earth. But when it came to the full development of individualism, the monastery proved a sad and grievous failure, a failure so disastrous and melancholy that the new world rejected the institution, with an indignation which has hardly its counterpart in the history of institutions. For if the individual would put himself to the fullest test in order to his divine growth, it must be accomplished by the discipline of relationships such as the monk rejected as unfit for the spiritual man. These relationships are twofold, that of the family and that of the state, through which alone can the highest manhood be attained. When the monk was condemning these relations as sinful or impossible for religion, he was flying in the face of eternal law and of the divine will as written in human constitutions. His contempt for marriage as a hindrance to grace may be regarded as the act of one who knew not what he did, but it was none the less an offence against both God and man. Its punishment may be seen to have grown in this case directly out of its nature, for they who aimed at purity became the scandal of the age for impurity; striving to be something above men, they fell below men, and degraded the human ideal. All this became apparent, when at last the state began to appear in its

conscious dignity, as in the pre-Reformation age which begins with the fourteenth century. The monk had been indifferent to the state, or its fortunes, since the first appearance of monasticism in the ancient church. But the state which he then neglected or abandoned was a declining one, the Roman Empire moving onwards to its fall, or else the feeble condition of statehood or nationality which was struggling for existence and growth in the Middle Ages. Under these circumstances, the monk had been at liberty to feel that his own commonwealth or citizenship was in the heavens, and that so far as earth was concerned, the true man was at home in every country. But when the modern state arose, as in England, such a sentiment could find little food for its support, if indeed the state had a right to tolerate the organizations which nourished it. It was dangerous to the nationality, for it might nourish disloyalty and treason, and the state needed the services as well as the faith and love of all its citizens.

When the modern state arose, the family regained its significance as the corner-stone of the structure. The family became again the tie which bound the individual in dependence on the state, for there is no tie so strong and deathless as this, nor is there a school equal to the family for training a man in the duties which are necessary to the existence or well-being of the state. Hence if the state were to survive and assert its fullest strength, it followed that monasticism must now be wholly suppressed, as in England under Henry VIII. Nor was it an accident or a merely humorous circumstance, that the crisis in English history in the hour of the Reformation did not hinge upon any subtle point of dogma, but upon the practical issue, whether the state should have the power to determine the marriage question, or whether some power external to the state, such as the papacy, should continue to retain the question within its jurisdiction.

Such are among the reasons why an institution like monasticism, to which humanity owes so much in one age, should become a desolation and an offence when its day was done. But in one sense it lived in an eternal day

which knew no decline, which still goes on increasing. In a most direct and vital way it had prepared for the Protestant Reformation, as if that had been the end of all its labors. Its essential principles were then reaffirmed in order to a higher and larger career, when those methods were abandoned which time had demonstrated were defeating its true mission, which were seen as no longer necessary to the perfection of a Christian man. Wycliffe was an opponent of monasticism on principle, and more particularly of the mendicant monks, as doing injury alike to religion and the state. But strong as was his dislike and even contempt of mendicancy, yet he made, in his condemnation of monasticism, an exception of the Begging Friars, as if he recognized in them some higher quality, which carried the promise of the future. He uttered a prophecy regarding them, which is extraordinary as foretelling an event, which found its fulfilment almost to the letter, in the coming of Martin Luther: "I anticipate that some of the friars, whom God shall be pleased to enlighten, will return with all devotion to the original religion of Christ, will lay aside their unfaithfulness, and with the consent of Antichrist, offered or solicited, will freely return to primitive truth and then build up the church as Paul did before them." [1]

VI

In this survey of the history of monasticism from its rise to its decline, some things become apparent as if they were the revelation enforced anew of the divine will in human society. Every direct specific purpose of the monk seemed in the long run to have been reversed, or to have proved a failure. He began with indifference to the extension of the visible church and ended with reviving the primitive order of the Apostolate for the conversion of Western Europe. His foremost aim was the salvation of his own soul, and he became the most successful of missionaries for

[1] *Trialogus*, IV., c. 30, p. 349; cf. Lechler's *Wycliffe and his English Precursors*, p. 323. By Antichrist is meant the papacy.

accomplishing the salvation of others. He left the world of towns and cities behind him, but where he went the world followed him and towns and cities sprang up around him. He started, as did the Montanists, his predecessors, with an inward revolt against the laws of outward nature, or the ties which bind the body and the soul together; he lived in deserts and in dens and in caves of the earth, he fought the constitution of his being with rigid and prolonged physical discipline. And yet it was the monk who was the first in the modern world, as in the case of St. Bernard or St. Francis, to acquire the love of nature. In the contact with nature, which was forced upon him by his desire to be in solitude and alone with God, there entered into his soul the healing power of nature through communion with its spirit. Through this communion with nature, which begot the love of nature, came the preparation for modern art. From holding the human body as an evil thing at war with the soul, he came to recognize the divineness of the human form as the expression of the inward spirit. He lived in the atmosphere of the miracle, a world of his own creation where all laws might be suspended at the bidding of faith, where the power of the holy man was revealed as stronger than the forces of life or death, and thus, as with Albert the Great or Roger Bacon, prepared the way for modern science which reveals nature as at the service of man. Monasticism started with a contempt for the human reason, as if intellect were necessarily at war with piety, and like the Montanist despised philosophy, as incompatible with true religion. But the monasteries, when they reached the height of their development, produced the scholars, the thinkers, the philosophers of the age. The one supreme object of scholasticism was to defend the doctrines of the church, but in order to this end it was necessary to cultivate the reason. When the process of scholasticism was complete, it ended in what is known as nominalism, which asserts the importance of the thinking mind as that which gives reality to human thought. In its origin, monasticism like Montanism was indifferent to the welfare of the state, fleeing to the desert to escape its

control. Its indifference to the political order, the absence of loyalty to one's country, or the sense of patriotism, had hastened the downfall of the Roman Empire. The monks contributed nothing to the cause of nationality: they were cosmopolitan, equally at home in every country. And yet it was the monks who were called to rule the world which they despised. It was a dream in ancient times that it would be desirable if a philosopher, who lightly regarded the world, could be brought to govern the world, sitting on the throne of the Roman Empire; and it happened once, in the case of Marcus Aurelius. So in the case of Hildebrand and of others who succeeded him, monks ruled over the states of Europe and subjected princes, kings, and emperors to their sway. They abandoned property and took the vow of poverty, but they could not escape from wealth. Each successive attempt to make the monasteries poor ended in their being richer than before. They cultivated obedience as an art, taking a special vow to obey, and the end of the process was individual freedom. They fought the family and the institution of marriage as beneath the spiritual man, seeking thus to make the *ecclesiola* of their Montanist forerunners something purer than the larger church, the bride of Christ without spot or wrinkle or any such thing; they took the vow of celibacy and called it chastity, and the result, it is needless to say, was such disastrous moral failure and collapse as to cast a discredit upon the system of the monastery from which it has not yet recovered.

But also beneath these vows and the whole attitude of monasticism toward nature and the state, there does run a deeper purpose which could not be defeated, — the accomplishment of individual personality. In the ancient world humanity was regarded as a composite part of organic nature, while the realization of the worth of the human soul as having supernatural significance was the precarious possession of the few. The monk in revolt against natural law, and in the cultivation of the miracle, was laying deep the foundation for human personality. And again in the ordering of the ancient state, there was

little or no conception of its function as ministering to individual freedom or development. A man was conceived as existing for the state, and was merged in the solidarity of those who were to be governed for the well-being of the whole. The deep impulse which Christianity gave to the demand for individual freedom by its assertion of the infinite value of a human soul drove the monk, if he would retain the priceless gift, to abandon the state to itself, in order that he might be free to cultivate his inward being through his conscious relationship to God.

The working of a similar process may be detected under the monastic vows of poverty, celibacy, and obedience. So long as in the old world a man was only entitled to consideration as a man by the possession of property, it became necessary to affirm that manhood could exist and assert itself by its own intrinsic quality, stripped of every accessory which in the eye of the law or of society gave him a fictitious interest or importance. The Roman theory of marriage had not only gradually brought the institution, in connection with other causes, into contempt, but by merging the family in the father, with the right of property in wife and children and control of human life, weakened if it did not destroy the possibility of attaining to the consciousness of individual selfhood. All the institutions of the ancient civilization needed to be purified and regenerated, reorganized upon some other basis, and to this end the monk contributed. They had to fight their way against the highest ideal of the age, the assumption of the monasteries that they had no spiritual value, to vindicate their worth by justifying themselves at the bar of a spiritual tribunal.

But it was chiefly in the vow of obedience that the monk accomplished and realized his freedom. In the Catholic church obedience also was required, but one could not choose his master. Men were born into the church, they no longer joined it, as in the early Christian centuries, of their own free will. The officers of the church, the bishop or the priest, they had no voice in electing. It was a vast authoritative system like the Roman Empire, whose power or decision were not to be resisted or ques-

tioned. There was only one outlet of relief, and that lay in the monastery which a man was at liberty to join, choosing the order which he preferred, and having a voice also in the choice of the abbot whom he was to serve. Under these conditions there was a freedom in the service which made it no longer bondage. A solidarity grew up in the monastery, but it was attained by the free concurrence of individual sentiment. Thus was preserved in germ, at least, the conception of the earlier church, when each Christian community chose its officers and invested them with authority. When in the course of the Middle Ages the bishops lost their control of the monasteries and the monks were exempted from episcopal supervision, they ceased when ordained to the priesthood to take the vow of obedience to the bishop, and in its place took the vow of obedience only to the head of the monastery.

But all this bears closely upon the later history of ecclesiastical organization. The secular clergy obeyed a bishop. the monastic clergy obeyed a presbyter. The tendency of monastic influence was thus to exalt the presbyter to the rank of the episcopate. The contention of Jerome, that in the beginning presbyters and bishops were equal, became the ruling principle of the monastery and left its influence upon the Catholic church itself. Cyprian had contended for an episcopate which was a distinct order from the presbyterate holding by direct divine right, while the presbyter held by mediated right through the bishops. The Catholic church has left the question an open one whether the bishop or the pope belong to distinct orders from the presbyterate or priesthood, or are not rather functions of the one only and common order of the priesthood. Although the monasteries were for the most part exempted from episcopal supervision, and the monastic clergy no longer took the vow of obedience to the bishop, yet they were still held in organic connection with the secular church by common subordination to the papacy. When the papacy declined and the pope finally lost his authority as in Germany or England, the monk went forth from his monastery, a presbyter still, but over whom there was no authority

in the church which could ask or rightfully command his obedience. In Germany and in Switzerland, two countries in which the monastic influence had been deeply felt from the time of their first conversion to Christianity, there arose in the age of the Reformation two churches, the Lutheran and the Reformed, organized upon the monastic principle which Jerome had asserted, that in the beginning there was no difference between the bishop and the presbyter.

And, finally, as the monasteries had their peculiar type of organization, so also they had their peculiar mode of worship. In the catholic cultus, the attention had been fastened on the eucharist, of which the bishop had been the administrator from the earliest appearance of the office. The development of the ritual of the altar may be regarded as the work of the episcopate or of the secular clergy. In the course of its growth, it had gradually superseded the homiletic worship of the early church, which consisted in prayer and praise, in the reading of Scripture, and the word of exhortation. This service, discarded in the secular church, was taken up by the monasteries, and attained an extraordinary fulness and rich complexity, but never losing its original motive, — the appeal to the individual attention as the condition of its success. As the Canon of the Mass was a popular service appealing to the eye with its accessories of color and light, and not demanding individual faith as the condition of its efficacy, but rather in itself an effective act, the *opus operatum*, representing the work of "Christ for us"; so on the other hand, in the monastic worship, the appeal was to the ear, the reason, and the conscience, whose motive was the "Christ within us." As the monks had accepted the ritual of the eucharist developed under the direction of the episcopate, so in turn the monastery won another victory, when the daily reading of the Breviary, the monastic book of devotions, was made compulsory upon the secular clergy.

CHAPTER X

THE GREEK CHURCH — NATIONALITY AND THE EPISCOPATE [1]

I

In the Latin or Roman Catholic Church, as it existed in the Middle Ages, the episcopate appears as subordinate to the papacy. It not only contributed nothing directly to the peculiar greatness of the Mediæval church, but was rather a foreign or an incongruous element, not wholly in sympathy with the papacy or monasticism, or with that peculiar scholastic philosophy which was the outcome and the crown of the Mediæval ecclesiastical system. The episcopate, as it had been conceived by Cyprian, was so changed in some of its fundamental aspects as to seem another and different institution. It submitted to the deprivation of its original claim by which it was authorized to rule the churches by divine right, or by the immediate grace of God. Under the papal régime the bishops practically held their office, only mediately from God, through the grace of the pope. The bishop

[1] Literature. — Finlay, *His. of Greece*, Vols. V., VI.; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, cc. xlix., liii.; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, B. IV., cc. 7, 8, 9, B. V., c. 3; Stanley, *His. of the Eastern Church;* Ffoulkes, *Schism between the Greek and Latin Churches;* Thierry, *Nestorius et Eutychès, les Grandes Hérésies du V^e Siècle;* Church, *Influences of Christianity upon National Character*, Lect. i.; Freeman, *The Byzantine Empire* in *Historical Essays*, 3d series, who discusses the reasons for the low estimate of the later Greek nation or empire; Le Beau, *His. du Bas-Empire;* Hertzberg, *Geschichte der Byzantiner.* The Sources are the Byzantine Historians, in Migne, *Patr. Gr.*, Nicephorus, Vol. 100, Theophanes, Anastasius, Genesius. Vols. 108, 109, Georgius Hamartolus, Vol. 110. See also the General Church Histories and article *Greece* in *Encyc. Brit.*

of Rome stood alone, in the sovereign exercise of ecclesiastical power by divine right. The bishops were further weakened by the emancipation of the monasteries from their control and jurisdiction, as well as by the elevation of great abbots, who, although presbyters, were in privileged cases designated prelates and allowed to wear the mitre, which was the symbol of the bishop's office and power. The secular clergy also had emancipated themselves to a certain extent from the authority of the episcopate, till the bishop's power, even in his own cathedral church, had been reduced to a shadow. But notwithstanding this reduction of his influence, the office of a bishop, even in the Latin church, still retained dignity and prestige, and even in the Middle Ages the bishops were still accomplishing a valuable work, and indeed indispensable, both for the church and for the world, for which they alone possessed the requisite qualifications, — a work which, without their co-operation, must have assumed some other form, if it had not failed altogether of its accomplishment. The work of the episcopate lay in aiding the consolidation of the secular state; it ministered to the national consciousness at a time when Christendom or the Holy Roman Empire stood in the way of the development of the modern nation.

This characteristic of the bishop, whether in the Eastern church or in Western Christendom, which makes him the natural ally of the secular state, inhered in his office from his first appearance in the church. It had been a mark of the Catholic church that it put the administration of ecclesiastical order above priest or prophet. Hence from the first the bishop became the bond which united the church with the world. A preaching clergy or a priesthood would magnify its office, and be more at the mercy of theories or opinions. It would be more likely to depreciate this world, in the interest of eternal and spiritual things. The monkish clergy of the Middle Ages had no special concern for the well-being of any particular state, nor were they the firmest props of the rising monarchies. But the bishop also magnified his office. His reverence for ecclesiastical affairs fitted him for the better

performance of the secular functions of the state, with which he was so often intrusted. He became the medium of communication therefore between the state and the church, and tended to counterbalance the exclusive predominance of the spiritual, which would reduce the temporal power to bondage and humiliation.

We discern the working of this principle, for which the episcopate stood, from the first appearance of the office in the second century. So far was the Catholic church secularized in the third century by the episcopate, despite the attitude of Cyprian, that its spiritual side was weakened. When Constantine proposed the alliance of church and state in the fourth century, the bishops at once became his most ardent supporters and allies. Not only did they see nothing incongruous in the closer relationship of the spiritual and the temporal, but they welcomed it as a sign of the divine favor, as if the completion of the divine revelation.[1]

It is the sense of nationality, which among all the divergent principles separating the Greek church from the Latin church is the most important, that has been also the most fruitful in vast consequences both for church and state. It is true that other causes lie nearer to the surface, to which is more palpably owing the great schism between Oriental and Occidental Christendom. While Greece and Rome had been ostensibly fused together in the Roman Empire, yet the natural tendencies of Greece had never been extirpated. It was impossible for the

[1] Eusebius of Cæsarea may be taken as the type and spokesman of the majority of the bishops in the East who welcomed the accession of Constantine as a divine providence, a sign of the divine interposition in behalf of the church. The Emperor was to Eusebius a sort of reflection of the supreme Word; the monarchy on earth a counterpart of the monarchy in heaven. As in the reign of Augustus, the Word had come in the flesh, so in the reign of Constantine, the Word had triumphed over the world. Cf. Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, and his oration at the Tricennalia of Constantine. For his relations with Constantine, cf. Art. *Eusebius*, by Bishop Lightfoot, in Smith and Wace, *Dic. Chris. Biog.* For what seems too much like the subserviency of the bishops to the successors of Constantine, see Ullmann, *Life of Gregory Nazianzen* (Eng. Trans.).

Catholic church to overcome divergences so deep-seated, so far-reaching in their results, as those which sprang from the difference of temperament and genius and culture, which marked the Greek civilization in comparison with the Latin. But the appreciation of the sacredness of nationality is, after all, the deepest motive which divided Eastern Christendom from the Latin church of the Middle Ages.

Catholicity, if that term can be used to include the organization of the church or its external aspects, was not a product of the Eastern mind, but of the Latin, and had been imported into the Orient after it had secured its form under Latin influence. It was the Roman spirit which had first developed the later doctrine of Apostolic succession, which had converted the clergy into a priesthood and separated them from the laity.[1] It was Rome which first possessed a list of bishops claiming to go back to Apostles, riveting the physical chain of continuity with Apostolic practice. During the third century the East accepted the institution of the episcopate in its Roman modification, but Apostolic succession has never been to the Greek church quite what it has been to the Latin mind. According to the Greek construction, the evidence that one has the succession is to be found in his holding the pure doctrine, while to the Western mind, the guarantee of pure doctrine is to be found only among those who can prove by their external descent that they hold the Apostolic succession. The Latin church was the

[1] That the Greek church has not made the same sharp distinction between clergy and laity which holds in the Latin church, finds one illustration among many in the controversy in the ninth century between Photius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, and the Bishop of Rome. "The pope's demand, that a law should be passed, forbidding any layman, after the death of Photius, to be elevated to the patriarchal dignity, was not complied with. The older examples were once more appealed to; it was said that every church, as the Roman, so also the church of Constantinople, had its own peculiar and traditional customs, by which the letter of the law must be interpreted. On this occasion many of the bishops declared in a noticeable manner against the idea of a separate and fixed caste of priests, and against the too sharply marked distinction between the clergy and the laity" (Neander, *Ch. His.* VI. 327).

first to formulate Christianity in a creed or "rule of faith" of which the type is the so-called Apostles' creed, originating in Rome about the middle of the second century. In the third century we have the creed imported into the East, but how differently conceived from the Western fashion is seen by the form it assumes in the preface of Origen's treatise concerning First Principles in theology. The creed of Rome was terse and practical, occupied with the assertion of historical facts. The Eastern creed is illumined with an intellectual or spiritual inference, revealing the subjective impression of facts upon the mind. It was also the Roman church which first undertook the formation of the canon of the New Testament determining the point at which the line should be drawn where inspiration within the church had come to an end. These were the external features of the growing Catholic church, which Eastern Christendom received to develop or modify in her own way, but did not originate.[1]

The event which controlled the destiny of the Greek church was the building of the city Constantinople. Like so many other moments in history, its significance was not recognized at the time. There may have been truth in the various interpretations which the rise of the new city received, as that Constantine was desirous of escaping from the heathenism which had its stronghold in the ancient capital; or that it was necessary that the centre of the Empire should be transferred to the East in order to meet the dangers which were threatened by the revival of the Persian Empire. But the full significance of the event appeared only when its results were manifest. The rise of Constantinople, says Mr. Freeman, "tended to draw into it the Hellenic element and concentrate it there, when before it had been diffused in great cities like Antioch and Alexandria." The city of Constantinople gave a national

[1] Cf. Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, I., pp. 400–412, for *Excursus* on *Katholisch und Römisch*. The designation of 'Orthodox' is the name by which the Greek church prefers to be known; and while claiming Catholicity, however it may be interpreted, she has left the designation of 'Catholic' to the sister church in the West.

centre to Greece, accomplishing for Greece what it had never been able to achieve under heathen auspices. Names, indeed, were not changed; it was the Roman Empire with a new capital as it seemed; but in reality it was another step in the dissolution of the Empire. One nation had been invested with the glory and the prestige which had been created by the city of Rome. Rome herself, the mistress of the nations, seemed to have yielded to Greece, and Empire to have been merged into nationality. What heathenism could not do, Christianity had done for Greece; it had disciplined its people and given them new motives of energy and a bond of unity. Nor was this a mere temporary process, a passing mood among the changing circumstances of history. The Greek nation, which began its career when Constantinople was founded, lasted for more than a thousand years before its melancholy fall into the hands of the Turks; which, so far as the lives of the nations go, is to be counted no ordinary duration. And further, it continued to exist among evils and dangers so great, that only some marvellous vitality could have enabled it to survive.[1]

[1] "Christianity created in them [the Greek race], in a new and characteristic degree, national endurance, national fellowship and sympathy, national hope. It took them in the unpromising condition in which it found them under the Empire, with their light, sensual, childish existence, their busy but futile and barren restlessness, their life of enjoyment or of suffering, as the case might be, but in either case purposeless and unmeaning; and by its gift of a religion of seriousness, conviction, and strength it gave them a new start in national history. It gave them an Empire of their own, which, undervalued as it is by those familiar with the *ultimate* results of Western history, yet withstood the assaults before which, for the moment, Western civilization sank, and which had the strength to last a life — a stirring and eventful life — of ten centuries. The Greek Empire, with all its evils and weaknesses, was yet in its time the only existing image in the world of a civilized state. It had arts, it had learning, it had military science and power; it was, for its day, the one refuge for peaceful industry. It had a place which we could ill afford to miss in the history of the world. Gibbon, we know, is no lover of anything Byzantine, or of anything Christian; but look at that picture which he has drawn of the Empire in the tenth century, — that dark century when all was so hopeless in the West, — read the pages in which he yields to the gorgeous magnificence of the spectacle before him, and describes not only the riches, the pomp, the splendor, the elaborate ceremony of the Byzantine court and the Byzantine capital, but the com-

In the rise of Greek nationality, where church and state seemed to be fused into one organism, we have the explanation of much that is obscure in ancient Catholic history. A new principle had now appeared in the Catholic church which was to modify its institutions, leading to schisms which could not be healed, but illustrating the spirit of Christianity in profound and wonderful ways. The Catholic church, as Rome conceived it, was from its very nature a creation, which could not know distinction of race or nation. But this was a conception of catholicity which the Greek church declined to receive from the hitherto victorious West. It may seem an external incident with no spiritual importance, that a nation should arise out of the declining Empire, and become, as it were, a spiritual law unto itself. But it was an event fraught with spiritual meaning, full of significance for the church, for religion, for theology, for all that concerns the deeper relations of human life. The features of catholicity, whether of organization, of creed, or of cultus, were destined in consequence to a modification of their inward import, till in some respects they should only faintly resemble, while in others they should widely diverge from the familiar Roman type. Rome had conceived of Catholic unity as resting upon an administrative basis, as having its origin in one man, and therefore to be maintained and perpetuated in one man whose undisputed sway should bring unity and harmony to the church. The first intimation that the Apostle Peter, as an individual man, was great enough and strong enough to be the foundation for the Catholic church is given in the pseudo-Clementine writings, where Peter is spoken of

parative prosperity of the provinces, the systematic legislation, the administrative experience and good sense with which the vast machine was kept going and its wealth developed, its military science and skill, the beauty and delicacy of its manufactures, — and then consider what an astonishing contrast to all else in those wild times was presented by the stability, the comparative peace, the culture, the liberal pursuits of this great state, and whether we have not become blind to what it was, and appeared to be, when it actually existed in the world of which it was the brilliant centre, by confusing it in our thoughts with the miseries of its overthrow" (Church, *Influence of Christianity upon National Character*, p. 31).

as "so great a man that he is worth more than the whole world."[1] Upon some such conviction the Roman church reposed when it proclaimed Peter as the source from which Catholic unity took its rise and by whom it was perpetuated through his successors, the bishops of Rome.

So also Cyprian had reasoned in his treatise on the *Unity of the Church*. It was to Peter first that Christ had given the divine commission, and although he had afterwards invested the other disciples with the same commission and given them an equal power, "yet that he might set forth unity, he arranged by His authority the origin of that unity as beginning here from one, and that one was Peter."[2] This interpretation of the mode and basis of Catholic unity was never received in the East. Origen spoke in behalf of its deeper convictions when he rebutted the position of Cyprian, by maintaining that the words spoken to Peter were spoken to him as a Christian man, not as an ecclesiastical administrator; "they were spoken to Peter and to every Peter; every Christian man is Peter."[3] In these two representative utterances the spirit of the Western and of the Eastern church may still be compared. The Greek church has never yielded for one moment in its history to the Latin conception of catholicity, which makes the unity of the church to consist in Peter or in any of his so-called successors in the Roman see.[4]

What the Greek church was attaining for itself when the spirit of nationality revived in the fourth century, she conceded also to other countries in the East, which in the decline of the Empire were beginning to feel, however feebly, the stirrings of national sentiment. The institu-

[1] *Clem. Rec.*, VII. 7. [2] *De Unit. Eccles.* iv.

[3] *Comm. on Matt.* xvi. 18.

[4] Cf. Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri*, Vol. I., for a full discussion of the Petrine claim; also Réville, *Les Orig. de l'Épis.*, pp. 35–43, who doubts the genuineness of the passage, Matt. xvi. 18, 19. These verses "appartiennent à une couche secondaire de la tradition évangélique. . . . Ils ne peuvent pas être authentiques sous leur forme actuelle, mais il est possible qu'ils soient le dévelopment ou l'altération de quelque parole primitive dans laquelle Jésus reconnaissait en Pierre le premier en date de ses véritables disciples" (p. 39). Cf. Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.*, I., p. 237.

tion of the 'patriarchate' was the embodiment of the Greek conception of Catholic unity. It might seem that the recognition of the great sees of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch was simply the natural culmination of the hierarchy; that after the bishops of capital cities in the provinces had been raised as metropolitans to authority over the other bishops, it was inevitable that the centralization should go further and develop into the predominance of the few, who presided in the great centres of the Empire. But the patriarchate involves another principle than that of a progressive centralization, or as it has been regarded, the effort after a closer correspondence between the government of the church and that of the Empire. The patriarchate stood for the national principle which Rome rejected and condemned. Others, like the bishops of Constantinople or Alexandria or Antioch, might be willing to receive the title of Patriarch, but Rome refused it, preferring to be known by other designations. The very word itself contained a suggestion of a principle to which Rome was averse, — the chief of a race or country. Had Rome been content to take the place among the patriarchates, to which it was assigned by the Eastern church, the course of history in Western Europe would have assumed a different form. It has sometimes been thought that had the Eastern church been more alive to the gravity of the situation, patriarchs would have been appointed for the remoter and unknown West, Spain and Gaul, Germany or Britain. But the national spirit had not as yet arisen in these countries, and Rome represented the only nationality of which the East was aware. Nor would it have served any useful purpose to nominate patriarchs in advance of the national sentiment. A nation might beget a patriarch, but a patriarch could not create a nation. In accordance with the prevailing theory of the age, which referred the origin of all ecclesiastical institutions to the twelve Apostles, Rome claimed St. Peter and Alexandria St. Mark as their respective founders. Constantinople, not willing to be behind in such a matter, claimed St. Andrew, the brother of Peter, and earlier called

than Peter to the Apostolic college. But so far as the East was concerned, this was hardly more than an empty sentiment, which placed the Eastern sees upon an equality with Rome, and at a later time elevated Jerusalem to the same dignity. The reality behind the form was the revival of the national spirit in the declining Roman Empire.

The Eastern church had acquiesced in the decision of the Council of Nicæa in 325, which confirmed the preponderance of the three great sees, Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, corresponding as it did to what seemed the facts of the situation. Ancient Greece had been fused with the Roman Empire as a constituent part, and when the Council of Nicæa was held had not yet become aware of the high destiny awaiting her. Egypt and Syria, however, represented by Alexandria and Antioch, had never been really incorporated into the Roman Empire. The recognition given them by the council as *quasi*-independent countries, on a footing of equality with Rome, though subordinate in dignity, was a concession to their sense of national importance which reconciled them to their position in one Catholic church. The trouble came when Constantinople as the seat of the Byzantine Empire, but in reality as the centre of the rising Greek nationality, not only claimed a place among the great sees of Christendom, but demanded a position between the dignities of Rome and Alexandria, the second place in rank, as being a new Rome. Such was the decision of the so-called Second General Council held at Constantinople in 381. But in advancing this high claim, the council created implacable hostility in two directions, for the new patriarchal see. Rome was indignant at an action which violated the first principle of Catholicity as it was conceived in the West, making impossible the unity and uniformity of ecclesiastical administration under one man; she resented also the impertinent intrusion of a new see which had no Apostolic foundation. The rise of Constantinople and her pretensions to high ecclesiastical dignity was simply what Rome needed in order to the more clear discernment of her own mission.

Henceforth the voice of Rome began to be heard, speaking with no uncertain sound; her opinions grew into decretals, and she was ready to claim universal supremacy. But on the other hand, the new patriarchate was equally unwelcome in the East, for it meant the superiority of Greece, disguised as the Roman Empire, over countries which, when they had submitted to Roman armies, had at least not accepted the hated domination of the Greeks. They could receive Rome as a mistress, they could accept Greece as a rival, but they would not yield to Greek supremacy.

From this time, or from the beginning of the fifth century, the unity of the Catholic church was doomed, as was also the unity of the Empire. From this time we date those controversies, about intricate points in theology, only intelligible to those who were concerned in them, — an evil weary age, in which ecclesiastical scandals abounded, which was rife in intrigues and dark suspicions, when the reputation of good men was destroyed, and even the darker crimes of murder and implacable hatreds which were worse than murder stained the records of the Catholic church. No period in Christian history is so painful, so unprofitable to study. If there is any consolation to be found, it lies in recalling that these strange hatreds among ecclesiastical persons were not really religious in their nature and origin, but rather political,[1] the last expiring efforts of deca-

[1] Cf. Freeman, E. A., in *Ed. Rev.*, 1858, also in *Historical Essays*, 3d series, *The Byzantine Empire*. "In the East religion and nationality are identical. The ordinary course is for a religion to be first formed by the working of the national mind and then to be adopted as the easiest definition of nationality. The instincts and tendencies of a race lead it either to adopt a distinct creed of its own or to modify the creed of another nation into a distinct form. In the East it is seldom that a nation can openly assert its distinct political existence. Its distinctive religion is commonly asserted as its outward badge. But if circumstances are favorable, the religious body thus formed may acquire a political being and may again become a nation."

"In Egypt and in Syria the nations chafed under the yoke of political subjection, but could not throw it off. Ages of foreign despotism had rendered them utterly incapable of military or political action. One field alone remained where they might still continue to assert their national independence in a new form. Ecclesiastical controversy formed the in-

dent nationalities, which had no future, to assert their independence; just as quarrels of elderly people, whose conscience is seared, whose outlook is hopeless, and whose time is short, surpass all others in bitterness of animosity and in recklessness of means. Unable to assert their political independence, Egypt and Syria, to a certain extent Rome, took refuge in theological formulas, whose divergence in some degree corresponded to national differences in tradition, thought, or temperament. If they were bound together by political ties, they were yet at liberty to have their own religions. It is still painful to recall how Egypt rose up in her angry might, and in her triumph became responsible for the banishment and death of the saintly Chrysostom, and succeeded in humiliating Constantinople; how, when flushed with her triumph, she made an alliance with Rome and succeeded again in humiliating the new see, through the banishment and death of Nestorius, and above all, in placing upon him the stigma of heresy, the sorest thrust at the reputation of her rival. Once again the tide of war rose high, and a third patriarch of Constantinople was trampled to death by the feet of an Egyptian mob. Then the tide turned, the humbled city of New Rome found an ally in Old Rome, and allowed the Roman bishop, Leo, to dictate the terms of a theological formula; and Egypt, realizing that the battle had gone against her, left the Catholic church and came up to trouble it no longer.

In the midst of these trials and scandals the Greek nation or church was consolidating her strength even in her weakness and humiliation. With the aid of Rome she had overcome Egypt, but the same council which was the result of the alliance, — the Fourth General Council at

tellectual food of the age. Intellects therefore which under other circumstances might have triumphed in the senate house or on the field of battle, now became the leaders of ecclesiastical sects, the orators of the pulpit, the victors in provincial or œcumenical councils. . . . The dissatisfied national mind, lacking physical vigor to venture on rebellion, had full scope to assert its independence in the shape of heresy. As in later times, the Greeks under Moslem or Catholic bondage consoled themselves by remaining Orthodox, so the Egyptians under the bondage of Orthodox Byzantium consoled themselves by becoming Monophysites" (*Ed. Rev.*, 1858, p. 328).

Chalcedon in 451, — became the culmination of the rivalry with Rome, which was finally to issue in schism. In response to Pope Leo, who urged upon the Greeks the supremacy of Rome, as the divinely ordained head of the church and the successor of Peter, the Greek church took the step of raising still higher the claim of Constantinople and placing it on a footing of equality with Rome. She did not deny the national equality of Rome, but she firmly rejected its claim to superior authority. Augustine had died in 430, the year before the Third General Council met. He had used the customary phrases about the unity of the Catholic church and its extension throughout the world; sects might exist here and there, having some local reputation; but the Catholic church existed everywhere and was to be found in every place: *Securus judicat orbis terrarum.* But had he lived twenty years longer, he would have seen Syria alienated, Egypt departed, and the foundations laid for the separation of Greece and Rome. The Catholic unity which he had defended against the Donatists, continued indeed to exist, but only as a sentiment survives when the reality has fled. The term 'Catholic' as a distinctive epithet appeared no longer to the Greek church a thing to be desired or coveted. She preferred to be known as the Holy Orthodox Church, a title which is still suggestive of the glory of her earlier heathen age, when Plato and Aristotle were training the Greek mind to habits of right thinking. Unlike the Roman church, she did not assume to be Catholic, in the sense of being everywhere extended, when it was no longer true. But also orthodoxy, while cherished in the West, was never to the Roman mind quite what it has been to the Greek. It was the highest virtue in the Latin church to submit in matters of thought, as in other things, to the obedience of the supreme pontiff. The Roman church appropriated the name of Catholic, defining it as union with the See of Peter, from whom unity takes its rise, and on this ground claiming to be still the Catholic church, one and universal, in virtue of the mystic significance, the perpetual appeal and obligation of a great idea.

II

To trace the gradual process of the schism between the Greek and Latin churches cannot be here attempted. Divergent forms of civilization, profound differences of intellectual temperament, the difference of language which prevented mutual understandings, the inability of Rome to comprehend the speculative mind of Greece, varying theological interpretations, whether of creeds or rites, — all these contributed to make the schism inevitable. But beneath these differences, and giving to them all their profoundest significance, was the national idea. The Greek church stood for national independence and the autonomy of national churches; the Roman church stood for imperialism, the subjection of nations and races in one Catholic organization to one sovereign will. The theological question of the *filioque*, whether the Spirit proceeds from the Father alone or from the Father and the Son, may, indeed, be discussed as an independent issue in scientific theology, but in ecclesiastical history it represents the national spirit in the Greek church refusing to accept imperial dictation, or interference with national freedom by a foreign power.

The Greek church has been in the main consistent in its national policy. Although in the rivalry with Rome, the bishop of Constantinople assumed titles which seem to indicate the highest arrogance, yet they carried with them no deep-seated purpose to subject to his will the national churches of the East. The bishop of Constantinople called himself the 'Universal Patriarch,' but it was an empty phrase as compared with the aspiration veiled under the garb of humility, in the title taken by the bishop of Rome, the 'Servant of the Servants of God.' The Byzantine church still recognized the other patriarchs of the East in their national capacity, and always maintained that a General Council, in order to possess validity, must be attested by their approval; a test which Rome rejected, evading it by the exigency of events or

boldly claiming that no council had authority until approved by the Roman pontiff. In their weak and mutilated condition, after the Monophysite schism, the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem continued to maintain this formal test of the validity of a General Council. But when, in the seventh century, they had fallen under Moslem rule, and no longer had freedom of action, the principle of nationality was narrowed down to the simple issue between Rome and Constantinople. It may seem as if Constantinople was the aggressor in the conflict with Rome, which now ensued; but it was Rome which was demanding subjection, not Constantinople. The one was fighting for supremacy, the other for freedom of national existence. It was in the interest of national independence that at the Second Trullan Council in 692, when the Byzantine church was perfecting its system of order and discipline in the shape in which it was to remain for centuries, the occasion was also taken to condemn the Roman church for disobedience to conciliar authority as well as for formal heresy.[1]

To those who are interested in the significance of minor issues in ecclesiastical affairs, the Byzantine church will appear on most of the points in which she then condemned the church of Rome as having at least a show of reason and authority. She reproved the Roman church for rejecting the 28th Canon of the Council of Chalcedon, which placed the see of Constantinople upon a footing of equality with Rome. She protested against the Roman purpose of subjecting the clergy to the rule of celibacy, although she was inconsistent, when she herself enforced celibacy on the episcopate. She insisted that the regulations of the Apostolic conference in Jerusalem were still binding, which prohibited the eating of things strangled, and of blood, while Rome regarded these injunctions as only of temporary obligation. She condemned the Roman custom of kneeling in the worship of

[1] For the Second Trullan Council, or the *Concilium Quinisextum*, as it is also called, cf. Mansi, XI., pp. 930–1006; Assemani, *Bibliotheca juris Orientalis*, 1766, Vols. I. and V.

the Lord's Day or at the Eucharist, as indicating some misapprehension of the relation of humanity to God. In the 80th Canon of the Second Trullan Council, which forbids all representations of Christ under the figure of a lamb, there may be a hint at some usage of the Roman church, about which little is known, but what information concerning which we do possess, would seem to indicate that the sacrificial conception of the eucharist had been pushed almost to the extent of animal sacrifice, as when a lamb was placed upon the altar.[1] She resented the Roman custom of fasting on Saturdays during Lent as an indignity done to the ancient Jewish Sabbath, — the perennial feast-day commemorating the joy of the creation. In all these points, in those even which seem unimportant, there is to be discerned the trace of an earlier apprehension of Christianity which differed from the Roman interpretation. The spiritual life which gave birth to these usages of the elder church may have grown feeble and inactive, but all the more tenaciously did she cling to them as if they enshrined some valuable relic, even if its worth could no longer be estimated.

The Second Trullan Council in 692 was then taking the first steps in the accomplishment of the schism between the East and West, by charging the Roman church with heresy and with insubordination to ecclesiastical authority. As time went on, the divergence grew wider and deeper, and other charges were alleged against Rome, which from the ecclesiastical point of view also possess no slight significance. The modification of the Nicene creed, by the Latin church in the ninth century, was to the Greek mind an unpardonable offence, an innovation on the ancient inviolable tradition, which ought not to have been made at all, but, if contemplated, should have been made by the concurrent voice of the universal church, an injury, therefore, to the very foundations of the faith as the Greek

[1] Cf. Gieseler, *Ec. His.*, II., p. 217: "Mentiuntur quoque, nos sicut per alia ipsorum conscripta indicatur, agnum in Pascha, more Judaeorum, super altare pariter cum dominico corpore benedicere et offerre" (Mansi, XV., 355). See also Hatch, *Hibbert Lectures*, 1888, p. 300.

church had received it. And, indeed, it was capable of this interpretation, an assertion of autonomy on the part of the revived Roman Empire of the West, corresponding also with the attitude of Charlemagne in the controversy over image worship, when the Greek church acted independently of the Western at the Seventh General Council (787). Another accusation was now added to the list of Roman heresies by Photius, the Patriarch of Constantinople († 891) when Rome was accused of robbing the presbyters of their inherent rights by confining the administration of the rite of confirmation to the bishops.[1] The Greek church had always allowed the performance of the rite by the presbyter, in contrast with the teaching of Cyprian, that the bishops were the primary depositary of the Spirit, or that the church was in the bishop. And one other heresy the Greek church at a later time imputed to the Roman, which as the latest seemed also the worst to the Greek mind, — the custom of using unleavened bread in the Eucharist. This was one of the innovations of Rome, which dates after the ninth century, the prelude to the coming doctrine of transubstantiation, that the bread in the Lord's supper should not be the bread of common life. The Roman church may have had its reasons for the change: there was the Jewish analogy of the Passover, and the connection of the Lord's supper with the Jewish festival of deliverance was no

[1] "One of the leading causes, or at least one of the alleged occasions of it [the schism between the Greek and Latin churches], was the contemptuous way in which the Latins treated the confirmations of the Greeks. As being administered by simple priests, they considered it null and void, and reconfirmed the Bulgarians, who had been recently converted to the faith by Greek missionaries. Photius raises an indignant outcry against what he describes as an unparalleled sacrilege, and argues that to deny to the priest the authority to confirm is to deny his priesthood altogether. In language highly colored by recollections of the Areopagite, he says: 'He consecrates the body and the blood of the Lord Christ, and with these sanctifies again those who were before admitted to the secret; how shall he not sanctify by anointing with the ointment those who are now in course of initiation? The priest baptizes, fully accomplishing upon the baptized the purifying gift; how, when he is the rightful accomplisher of the purification, will you deprive him of the guard and seal of it?'" (*Epis.* I., xiii. 7.) Mason, *The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*, p. 386. Cf. also Hergenröther, *Photius, Patriarch von Constantinopel*, 1867.

slight point to maintain. But the passionate indignation among the Greeks which showed itself in unseemly ways, at what may appear to some so slight a circumstance, does also indicate that there was a vital difference between the churches from the first in regard to this great central rite of the Christian church. To the Greek mind it was indispensable to its true celebration, that the bread of spiritual life should be transmuted from the bread of ordinary life.

These ritual or theological differences, whatever view may be taken of them, are bound together in the assertion of one consistent purpose; on the one hand the assertion of its independent national existence by the Greek church, and on the other aspiration for a sovereignty over the nations by the pope, who as in himself the highest source and sanction of ecclesiastical law could dispense with councils or alter their decrees at his will. The political issue became clearer to the bishop of Rome and to the Eastern emperor, in the early half of the eighth century, when Leo the Isaurian was conducting his remarkable correspondence with Pope Gregory II. Already the pope was preparing to turn away from the East, where his attempt to assert his sovereignty had ended in failure. A new and stable monarchy was growing up in Gaul and although the papacy with its ancient ties and associations preferred the older civilization out of which it had sprung, to the barbarous states of the West, and it must have seemed like humiliation to its ancient lineage that a bishop of Rome should profess allegiance to barbarian kings; yet the emergency was so great when the Lombards were threatening to take possession of Rome and to merge it into an united Italy, that the popes bent to the necessities of the hour, and prepared to sever the connection with the ancient Roman Empire of the East. There was no longer anything to be gained by the papacy, in continuing to pay allegiance to the emperor at Constantinople: no help could be expected from him in relieving Rome from its distress. Only the sentiment remained which reverenced the Roman Empire as the immutable purpose of God, — a sentiment from which the Roman papacy had originally drawn

its inspiration. That sentiment was now to change its form and to take a new lease of life, by which the papacy would secure in Western Christendom what it had failed to attain in the Eastern church.

The attitude of Gregory II. when writing to Leo, the Eastern emperor, shows an independent and defiant spirit. Leo had been endeavoring to suppress image worship in the Byzantine Empire, under the conviction that the Mohammedans had the advantage of the Catholic church when they condemned the worship of the creature and laid supreme stress upon the worship of one absolute and sovereign will. But in his effort to secure the abolition of the images, the Emperor encountered the sharp opposition of Rome. In reply to the Emperor's threat to chastise the Pope, and to carry him captive to Constantinople, Gregory II. assured him it was no longer possible; it was as impossible as to pursue the winds. He threatens the Emperor with a revolt of the West from his authority if he persists in his purpose to exterminate worship of images. Finally he utters the words which express the literal truth of the situation: "The bishops of Rome are as a wall between the East and the West."[1]

The connection of the West with the Byzantine Empire had been but a nominal one since the fall of the Western Empire in the year 476. How much that date may actually represent is among the undetermined problems of history. One might do justice to the confusion and contradiction of the time as to what had happened, by recognizing that as an actual fact the Roman Empire in the West had been destroyed and its place occupied by barbarian kingdoms. But the fact went for nothing compared with the sentiment or the idea, — the popular belief that the Western Empire had not fallen, that the Eastern emperor still represented the true authority over the West and that with his consent barbarian princes were allowed to rule in the West as his deputies. Under the influence of this sentiment the bishops of Rome had still continued to give

[1] For the letters of Gregory cf. Baronius, *Annal.* 736, 31. See also *Dict. Chris. Biog.*, Art. *Leo III.*; and for councils, Mansi XII.

their allegiance to the Byzantine ruler. When Gregory II. was writing to Leo, the last vestige of imperial power in Italy was fading away, and it is plain from their correspondence that both Pope and Emperor realize the fact. But the power of a sentiment which dominates and interprets the fact, till the actual event loses its significance in the light of an idea or conviction, was never more powerfully illustrated than in the transactions of the eighth century. The Eastern emperor took the step which precipitated the great change. Leo was one of the most vigorous rulers and far-seeing of statesmen. Realizing as he did that Gregory's fealty to himself was at the vanishing-point, he acted before it was too late; he withdrew the countries of Illyria, Greece, and Macedonia, Sicily and estates in Southern Italy, from papal jurisdiction and placed them under the ecclesiastical control of the bishop of Constantinople. It is strange that they should have been allowed to remain so long in subjection to Rome. But this event, which increased the power of the Eastern patriarchate, finally sundered the ties which bound the Roman bishops to the East.

In the eighth century a new inspiration began to dawn in the soul of the papacy — a genuine and deep conviction, it must have been, though owing its source to mixed and uncertain motives, that God was abandoning the world of the East and had entrusted the headship of the Roman Empire to the great monarch of the West. When Charlemagne had consolidated his power, he appeared as a prince ruling within the ancient confines of the Empire, but with a territory vastly larger than the Empire had ever possessed. The power was his; the Eastern Empire was weak and threatened by great dangers; it must be the divine will, therefore, that the crown of the Cæsars should be transferred from the East to the West; the divine symbol of authority must be made to correspond with the reality. The bishop of Rome was not the agent of the transaction, but its spokesman only, acting as a prophet to declare the will of God. He was simply doing what the prophet Samuel had done, when he declared the transfer

of the crown from Saul to David. The new order in the West reposed upon prophecy for its justification, when the tangible succession was lacking. Once in the history of the papacy, the pope himself posed as a prophet to proclaim the will of God speaking by direct communication from the heavens. In this way the papacy reconciled itself to the transfer of its allegiance from the ancient Roman emperor to the Carolingian king.[1] Facts and imaginative sentiment, belief in a divine will which ordered human events,—all these combined to create one of the supreme moments of history. Western Christendom was advancing into the future under the inspiration of a great conviction, and the darkness of the West was illumined as with a divine light. The Eastern emperor retired into the background, and from this time ceased to be a factor in the greater history which Western Europe was to evolve. The Eastern church as well was gradually ignored or forgotten, till at last it almost required an effort to realize that it still existed, or formed any part of Christendom, or was contributing any service to the kingdom of God.

The history of the Greek church, after the practical consummation of the great schism by the coronation of Charlemagne presents no incidents of importance beyond its maintenance of the principle that catholicity is consistent with the existence of national and independent churches, that catholic unity does not require subordination of the nations to one imperial and sovereign head. That became the issue in East and West alike. The bishop of Rome had taken lessons in the art of ecclesiastical administration from the sore experience of his rivalry with Constantinople. To his mind independent and coequal patriarchates stood for centrifugal tendencies, which broke up the unity of the church. There was to be no repetition of this evil in the Holy Roman Church and Empire of the West.

But in the Greek church we have an illustration, of no

[1] On the allegiance of the bishops of Rome to the Eastern Emperor, cf. Lea, H. C., *Studies in Church History*, pp. 14–42.

slight value as an actual experiment, that the highest bond of Christian unity is not necessarily an administrative or centralizing ecclesiasticism. The Greek church had its missionaries and its conquests. The Slavic races became related to it, as the Teutonic races in the West were related to Rome. But as the new races in the East were converted, each was allowed to have the divine offices in the vernacular, and each to have its own independent administration, recognizing only the tie of gratitude which bound it in reverence to Constantinople, whose primacy was of honor, but not of supremacy. The great event in the history of the Greek church was the conversion of Russia, which so far as territory and numbers were concerned, placed it upon an almost equal footing with the Latin church of the East. It is interesting to read the story which records how Russia was led to choose the religion of Constantinople, in preference to that of Islam or of Rome.[1] But it is more important here to note how when the Russian church, having increased in extent and numbers, desired its own independent government, the see of Constantinople adopted the plastic principle of the national patriarchate, as it had developed in the fourth century, and the new-made Patriarch of Moscow took his place on a ground of equality with the ancient patriarchal sees. At a later time, in 1823, when the patriarchate of Moscow fell into disfavor with the head of the state, an agreement was easily reached between the Czar and the Patriarch of Constantinople by which it was abolished and its powers delegated to a commission of bishops known as the Most Holy Governing Synod. In like manner, when Greece achieved its independence and preferred an arrangement for the government of its church similar to that which had been adopted in Russia, the Patriarch of Constantinople in 1852 recognized the Holy Synod of Greece as representing this independent branch in the family of national churches. The principle of the independence of the national church was also recognized in Georgia, in Servia, in Roumania, and in Montenegro. In

[1] Stanley, *His. of the Eastern Church*, Lect. ix.

these obscure principalities, as also in Greece, it was the church which had been, during ages of oppression, the bearer of the nationality, in which alone the national consciousness and aspiration found expression and was nourished, till independence and freedom had been achieved.

Nor is the bond a weak one which unites these independent national churches in the larger organization of the Greek church, or, as it prefers to be called, the Holy Orthodox Church of the East. The sense of unity reposes upon a common creed, whose conservation is the tie of coherence not only among themselves as independent churches, but, as it is devoutly believed, with the church of all ages back to its Apostolic origin. Whatever criticism has been made upon the unintelligent, uncritical adherence to formularies which characterizes the Eastern church, and although it has been regarded as the cause of that sterile immobility which weakens her life and efficiency, yet as a bond of unity, at least, it has been more effective, more conservative and enduring, than the ecclesiastical principle which prevailed in the West, where the unity takes its rise from the one man who occupies the see of Peter, in obedience to whom is thought to lie the essence of the Christian faith. But the comparison between the organization of the Greek and Latin churches is incomplete, until the development of nationalities has been traced in Western Europe. In the East nationality took refuge in the church and in theological formulas at the moment when the Roman Empire was in disintegration. In the West, the church fled for shelter and protection to spiritual Rome, an intangible, impalpable sentiment indeed, but one which proved more real and powerful, while its mission endured, than secular Rome in the days of the plenitude of its power.

CHAPTER XI

THE EPISCOPATE AND THE PAPACY[1]

THE office of the episcopate underwent no development in the Eastern church after the rise of the patriarchate in the fifth century. It continued to retain its original character as a mediator between things spiritual and secular, affiliating easily with the rising nationalities. The greatest change which it experienced had been when monasticism arose and forced it into compromises alien to its original spirit. Among those who best illustrated its character after this modification were Basil, the two Gregories, and Chrysostom, all of whom had felt the influence of the monastic spirit, shown in the cultivation of preaching as an art, or in a more intense devotion to theological principles, instead of the more practical views of the Catholic church and its mission which marked the office at its birth. Even in the East there were instances of rivalry between the bishops and the monasteries, but for the most parts the law prevailed which subjected the monastery to the bishop's control. The bishops accepted

[1] Cf. for the history of ecclesiastical organization, *Monumenta Germaniæ Historica*, ed. by Pertz or by Boretius; Jaffé, *Bibliotheca Rerum Germanicarum;* for the councils, Mansi and Hefele; for the Council of Constance, H. von der Hardt, *Magnum œcumenicum Constantiense Concilium*, etc., and *Hist. Conc. Const.;* Hinschius, *Decretales pseudo-isidorianæ;* Gieseler, *Ec. His.*, Vol. III.; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, Vol. VII.; Creighton, *His. of the Papacy;* Emerton, *Mediæval Europe*, with valuable bibliographical introduction; Hatch, *Growth of Church Institutions;* Lea, *Studies in Church History;* Mulford, *The Nation;* Wells, *The Age of Charlemagne;* Coulanges, *The Ancient City;* Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire;* Guizot, *His. of Civ. in France;* Lavisse, *L'Histoire Politique de l'Europe* (Eng. Tr. by Gross); Laurent, *Études sur l'Histoire de l'Humanité*, Vol. V., *Les Barberes et le Catholicisme;* Giesebrecht, *Geschichte der Deutschen Kaiserzeit;* Richter, *Annalen der Deutschen Geschichte;* Hauck, *Kirchengesch. Deutschlands;* the general Church Histories, among others Chastel, Moeller, Kurtz.

the sovereignty of the state; and the office of Emperor assumed a *quasi*-sacred character, which seemed to justify not only his superintendence over the external relations of the church with the Empire, but also his interference or mediation in theological controversies when they threatened the well-being of the state. There were occasional conflicts between the sovereign and his bishops, as in the Image Controversy, when the bishops at times sided with the emperor in sustaining the iconoclastic principle or again resisted him. But the emperor had the welfare of the church at heart as closely as the bishops, since the church was only another aspect of the state. There was no great issue at stake which separated the spiritual from the secular, or led to antagonisms between church and state which could not be healed. Stability was thus finally secured, but progress was sacrificed.

It was otherwise in Western Europe, where the episcopate had a history and a development which includes marked changes in the office, conflicts which affected the life of the state as well as of the church, in which also were involved the interests of morals and religion. It was forced to confront great obstacles which seemed to hinder its success; it had a powerful rival in the monastic orders; it was at the mercy at one time of secular rulers, and at another of the papacy. But if it seemed to be threatened with failure through its secularization, yet it maintained that distinctive character with which it was endowed at its origin and in its own important way contributed to the development of civilization, and ultimately to the elevation of the church.

After the death of Syagrius, the Roman governor, in the closing years of the fifth century, Clovis became the head of a new monarchy in Gaul, and as a Catholic king was welcomed as a second Constantine. The first change to be noted is the transition of the bishop from being the local pastor in the town or city to the ruler of a large diocese. Although the change was an important one, yet it was accomplished by causes so natural and inevitable, springing so directly from the situation and the character

of the office, that it was not felt as a revolution which involved still greater changes in state and church. When the Roman government broke down in Gaul, the bishop was left as the foremost citizen in the old municipalities, the bearer of the Roman traditions and culture, to whom it was natural that the Roman population should look as its head and protector. He had been accustomed to act as a financial administrator and as a judge in secular affairs as well as ecclesiastical, thus gaining qualifications which fitted him for a larger sphere of authority. The expansion of the bishop's diocese, which in the ancient church had been limited by the town or city, or its immediate environment, was effected by the combination of the municipality with the Teutonic *gau* or county; so that he now claimed jurisdiction over the large territory surrounding his municipality, in which towns and cities were yet to be built, and where hundreds of parishes were yet to be planted.[1] The bishops were already important personages, invested with the spiritual reverence of the people as well as with secular power, when they welcomed the newly converted monarch as the head of the state. The tendency in the episcopate to an alliance with the earthly sovereign, as though there were nothing incompatible in the relation, but on the contrary it had been divinely ordered for their mutual well-being, was illustrated anew and in a most impressive manner. It was fortunate for Clovis, the new king, that he received this support. He became the Eldest Son

[1] Cf. *ante*, p. 107. "Instead of each newly formed community having its complete ecclesiastical organization, as had been the case in Asia Minor and North Africa, the authority of the city bishop was conceived to extend over all the communities within the district of which the city was the political centre. For in the fusion of Teutonic with what remained of Roman institutions, the Roman *civitas* was taken as the centre of the Teutonic *gau*, or county, a union of two systems of administration which was aided partly by the fact that even in Roman times the *civitas* had round it a certain area or 'territorium' (a term which is occasionally used to designate the bishop's diocese of later times), and partly by the fact that the *gau*, or county, was probably only the revival or the perpetuation of an earlier Celtic division. . . . It was in this way that the diocese, in its modern sense, came to exist; the conception of it was Teutonic, the framework was Roman" (Hatch, *Growth of Church Institutions*, p. 14).

of the Church, and the foundations were laid thus early for the nationality of France.

These relations of the bishops to the Merovingian monarchs continued through the sixth century, despite the difficulties and the dangers which threatened to break the alliance. But at this moment were also begotten those great evils from which the episcopate suffered through the Middle Ages, and from which it was not able to escape. The bishops became rich in lands and estates, through the gifts which were heaped upon them by grateful sovereigns, or by the piety of individuals, of whose wealth they seemed to be the most appropriate heirs. Just as the piety of the time took shape in the donations to them of every kind of property, so the piety of the bishops was shown in the faithful administration of property by which it continued to increase. Secular lords might prove extravagant and reckless, with no sense of the value of their estates; but the model bishop held his property as a divine possession, not to be alienated but multiplied, as talents entrusted to him, which it was his duty to increase many fold. Even his Merovingian masters, who had enriched him with such prodigality, began to be alarmed at his growing power. "Behold," said Chilpéric, "our treasury remains poor, because our wealth is transferred to the churches. No one has any authority except the bishops. Our dignity is perishing, and has passed over to bishops of the cities."[1]

The increasing power of the bishops in Gaul during the sixth century gave significance to the contentions which now began as to the method of their appointment. And another issue, closely connected with the appointment of the bishops, was the necessity of placing them in subjection to some authority. When in the age of Cyprian, and under his influence, the power of appointing bishops was taken from the congregation, the rule had been adopted that they should be designated and confirmed by the bishops of the neighboring provinces. This rule had been adopted at the Council of Nicæa, when the concurrence of three bishops was made necessary to a valid

[1] *Greg. Turon.*, VI., c. 46.

appointment. But in Cyprian's time no method had been provided by which the bishops themselves should be controlled, nor had Cyprian felt the necessity of such supervision; for the church had not as yet come into organic relationship with the state. Ecclesiastical synods, held twice a year in the province, under the presidency of the metropolitan bishop, in which the bishops legislated in freedom, was considered an adequate government for the church. Such was the method of the early Gallic bishops in the sixth century. They had their metropolitans, whose presidency, however, was merely nominal, and in their councils they enacted canons for the government of the church, a procedure in which they were aided by the kings. Councils were not infrequent during the sixth century, nor do the bishops appear as lacking a sense of responsibility for the removal of the evils which the age was generating in church and state alike.

But the situation in the sixth century had greatly changed since the days of Cyprian, when the bishop was the pastor, for the most part, of a local church, when he was yet poor in worldly goods, and had not attained the combined authority of a secular and spiritual magnate. If the bishops consented to their endowments by the state, through which they had come into possession of a great part of its territory, there must be also some corresponding obligations to the head of the state. It seemed fitting that the monarch should appoint to an office which was becoming a secular dignity, and by its union with spiritual power threatened, unless brought into subjection to the state, to be dangerous to the sovereign's authority. The bishops in vain struggled against the purpose which made appointments to the episcopate dependent on the will of the king. They enacted canons in which the older methods were declared still binding. At the Council of Paris (A.D. 615), held in the time of Clotaire II., they declared all other methods null and void; but the king, in his edict approving the canons, commanded that no bishop should be consecrated without the royal approval.[1]

[1] Cf. Mansi, X., pp. 539 ff.; Hefele, IV., p. 440 (Eng. Trans.).

From this time, and during the seventh century, the kings designated their favorites for the episcopal chair, with the result that councils almost entirely ceased to be held and the church lapsed into indescribable confusion and moral decay. The bishops too often had no spiritual qualifications for their office and pretended to none, gaining their position by flattery and bribery and intrigue. In some cases they may have been without ordination or consecration, desiring the office only for its emoluments, and seeking to increase their wealth and power. The clergy in the parishes were under no discipline, neglecting their duties, spending their time in rioting and drunkenness and sensuality. The situation grew worse under the mayors of the palace, who supplanted the Merovingian kings, after the death of Dagobert in 639. The territory of the church was confiscated by Charles Martel, who boldly appointed his servants to the sees of bishops and met no longer with any resistance. The episcopate had failed to meet the situation and was unable to provide a remedy.

The first suggestion of reform came not from the episcopate, but from the monastery. In its disordered, immoral condition, the Frankish church had done nothing for the conversion of the heathen in those adjacent countries which now constitute Germany, where the remains of an earlier Christianity, which were but few, had been almost swept away. This vast work had been first undertaken by monks from Ireland and Scotland, who had not felt the influence of Roman civilization, nor as yet been brought into any organic relation with the Catholic church; where bishops indeed existed, but lived in monasteries under the supervision of the presbyter-abbots. These monasteries still maintained the Christian faith in its purity and earnestness, cultivating the missionary spirit to such an extent that the continent soon began to swarm with men whose object was to proclaim the salvation of Christ.[1] They had done a great part of their work with success,

[1] For the work of the Irish-Scotch missionaries, cf. Ebrard, *Die iro-schott. Missionskirche*, 1873; also Kurtz, *Ch. His.*, I., § 78 (Eng. Trans.).

when they were followed by an English monk, a Saxon by birth, Boniface (680–755 A.D.), to whom has been assigned the title of Apostle of Germany. Others labored and he entered into their labors. It was one part of his aim, of course, to extend the Christian faith, and he wrought powerfully to this end. But he had other motives as well: it was the cherished purpose of his life to overcome the Irish and Scotch missionaries, to organize the church upon a new basis by subjecting it to the authority of the bishop of Rome. He went from England, which alone of the countries of Western Europe was already owing its conversion to the missionary zeal of a Roman bishop, Pope Gregory the Great, who little dreamed of the vast results which were to follow his interest in that remote and practically heathen land. The conversion of England under the auspices of Rome was the beginning of a vast process, which took centuries to accomplish, and ended in the supremacy of Rome. Pope Gregory the Great had taken a most unusual step when he authorized the consecration of Augustine as the missionary bishop of Canterbury. His successor after a long interval, Pope Gregory II., took another unauthorized step when he consecrated Boniface as a regionary bishop for Germany. It was a step which defied the ancient canons and the law of procedure as it had been laid down by Cyprian and confirmed by the Council of Nicæa. It meant that in an emergency Rome felt tied by no precedents, but adapted herself to the situation. So also Gregory the Great had acted most unwarrantably, if the ancient canons were to be observed, when from his elevated point of view, as the waves of the barbarian invasion were subsiding, he had spoken to the new world in the West, and called the bishops to order. Some had listened to him, as in Spain or Illyria or Africa, but in Gaul his voice had fallen unheeded. He had no right to speak, but he rose spontaneously and depended for a hearing on the ancient sentiment of reverence for the Eternal City, as well as on the conscience in men which demanded order at all hazards without regard to the methods by which it was obtained.

Boniface handed over the fruits of his missionary labors in Germany to Rome. He was a born administrator, whose capacity for organization amounted to genius. Germany was divided into bishopries before the state existed or had effected a stable government, — a circumstance which accounts for much in its later ecclesiastical history. After the death of Charles Martel (742), Boniface was allowed by Pepin to reorganize the Frankish church. The records of councils at this moment may fail us, but the motive and the method of the unrivalled organizer is clear. His object was to subordinate the parish clergy by an oath of allegiance to the bishop,[1] and to subject the bishops by a similar oath to the authority of Rome.[2] The ideal survived, even though he failed in the immediate accomplishment of his aim; it continued to work as a leaven amid

[1] For the subordination of the parish clergy by a formal oath of obedience to the bishop, constituting a sort of feudal relationship, cf. Hatch, *Growth of Church Institutions*, pp. 33, 46. In the ancient church the presbyter was subject to the whole body of bishops, legislating in council; in the Middle Ages, each bishop claimed a direct personal authority over the clergy in his diocese.

[2] The oath of Boniface to the bishop of Rome is interesting as revealing his entire devotion and the spirit in which he worked.

"I, Boniface, bishop by the grace of God, promise to thee, blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, and to thy vicar, the holy Gregory, and to his successors, by the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, the holy and indivisible Trinity, and by thy sacred body, here present, always to keep a perfect fidelity to the holy Catholic faith; to remain, with the aid of God, in the unity of that faith, upon which, without doubt, depends the whole salvation of Christians; not to lend myself, upon the instigation of any one, to anything which can be against the universal church, and to prove, in all things, my fidelity, the pureness of my faith, and my entire devotion to thee, to the interests of thy church, who hast received from God the power to tie and to untie, to thy said vicar, and to his successors: and if I learn that the bishops are against the ancient rule of the holy fathers, I promise to have no alliance nor communion with them, any more than to repress them if I am able; if not, I will inform my apostolic lord. And if (which God forbid!) I ever, whether by will or occasion, do anything against these my promises, let me be found guilty at the eternal judgment — let me incur the chastisement of Ananias and of Sapphira, who dared to lie unto you, and despoil you of part of their property. I, Boniface, a humble bishop, have with my own hand written this attestation of oath, and depositing it on the most sacred body of the sacred Peter, I have, as it is prescribed, taking God to judge and witness, made the oath, which I promise to keep" (Bonif. *Epis.* cxviii.). Cf. Guizot, *His. of Civ.*, II., pp. 175 ff. (Eng. Trans.).

opposition or neglect, till at last it triumphed in the subjection of all Western Christendom to the sway of ecclesiastical Rome.

Boniface died in 755, after having established the church in Germany and reorganized it in France. He left good men devoted to their work in the sees which he founded; he had also created monasteries, which were to become centres of inspiration and moral zeal. He had overcome the Scotch and Irish clergy and driven them from the field, under the stigma of heresy and schism. But his immediate purpose of bringing the bishops under the control of Rome had not been accomplished. The Frankish monarchy which rose into unity and power, under Charlemagne proposed to use the church and the bishops as the means of maintaining order in the state; but it was no part of Charlemagne's intention to allow the bishopric of Rome the supreme control of the church. He himself was to be the final court of appeal for the bishops and clergy. In the interest of a better supervision of the bishops, he revived the order of Metropolitans, or Archbishops, an office which had failed under the Merovingian kings to attain any development or to serve as any check upon the episcopate.[1] We may see at a glance the method of Charlemagne for controlling the bishops in what is called the Capitulary of Frankfort (A.D. 794):

"It is enacted by our lord the king and the holy synod that bishops shall exercise jurisdiction in their dioceses. If any abbot, presbyter, deacon, monk, or other clerk, or, indeed, any one else in the diocese does not obey the person of his bishop, they shall come to his metropolitan and he shall judge the cause together with his suffragans.

[1] "With the growing interference of the Merovingian kings in ecclesiastical affairs, and the increasing decay of religious life which marked the end of the seventh and the part of the eighth century, the whole system, both of metropolitans and of provincial synods, tended to pass away in Gaul, and the whirlwind of Arab conquests swept it away in Spain. There was a growing independence on the part of diocesan bishops, and consequently a growing disintegration of the church as a whole" (Hatch, *Growth of Church Institutions*, p. 126).

Our counts also shall come to the court of the bishops. And if there be anything which the metropolitan bishop cannot set right, then let accusers and accused both come with a letter from the metropolitan, that we may know the truth of the matter."[1]

To the bishops, who combined with their ecclesiastical authority the rank and distinction of the secular nobility, together with the wealth which they were bent on increasing, it must have seemed something like a degradation when Charlemagne subjected them to the control of the metropolitan, an arbitrary office as it were, constituted by the will of the monarch and not founded in any principle of divine right. There is evidence that the bishops in the time of Charlemagne were beginning to be restive under this new check upon their freedom, but the Emperor was too powerful for them to attempt an open resistance. Under his weak successor Lewis the Pious (814–840 A.D.), whose interest in the church and religious things was even more pronounced than his father's had been, while also his secular sway was not so vigorous, the bishops began to prepare for their revolt. There are some sinister circumstances in the history of the church at this period, which cannot be passed over in silence. When the sons of Lewis the Pious rose up in rebellion against their father, and having thrown him into prison continued to retain him there in humiliating captivity, their unfilial conduct was supported by the bishops. Again at a later time when Lothaire II. of Lotharingia wished to put away one wife in order to marry another, his action was approved and supported by his bishops whom he won over to his cause, while the pope resisted and condemned him, standing as the protector of morals at a critical juncture when failure might have been disastrous to the moral development of Christendom.

The process by which the bishops sought emancipation from the control of metropolitans, an emancipation which was also intended to carry with it the deliverance from imperial authority, is still veiled in mystery, as it also had

[1] Cf. Pertz, *Mon. Germ. His. Legum*, I. 72; also Hatch, p. 128.

its origin in a secrecy which studiously avoided the light. The responsibility for the stupendous forgery known as the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals was formerly laid at the door of the papacy for the reason that it resulted in the consolidation of papal supremacy. But later research justifies the conclusion that the system of church government which the Forged Decretals set forth was the finished product of the monastic ideal first conceived and partly accomplished by Boniface. The spirit of the system was anti-national — an effort to detach the bishops from dependence on the secular power, and to make them responsible to the pope alone. It constituted a strong appeal to the bishops, for it appeared at a moment when they were restive under the vigorous authority of metropolitans, as well as suffering from the evils of secular interference. From the tyranny of local tribunals it offered an escape to the more distant impartial authority of Rome. The prominence of this feature in the Forged Decretals obscures their ulterior purpose which is the ecclesiastical supremacy of the papacy in the place of metropolitan or conciliar authority. The result of the system, even so early as the generation following its appearance, betrays its purpose: it was at once appropriated by the popes, it became the basis of ecclesiastical law, it retarded the growth of nationalism, and it brought the episcopate under the immediate control of Rome. And yet, though it remained the basis of the Canon Law for centuries, it could not extinguish the natural tie which made the bishop the ally of the sovereign and the supporter of the national purpose.[1]

[1] The best edition of the Forged Decretals is by Hinschius; they are also given in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* Vol. CXXX. For the discussion of their origin and purpose, cf. Wasserschleben, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der falschen Dekretalen;* also, by the same, *Die pseudo-isidorische Frage*, in *Zeitschrift f. Kirchenrecht*, IV.; and article in Herzog, *Real Encyc.* For the so-called Donation of Constantine, which was nearly contemporaneous with the Forged Decretals, combining with them in the foundations for papal authority, cf. Döllinger, *Fables and Prophecies of the Middle Ages*, § v.

II

The time of the Forged Decretals is about the middle of the ninth century, nearly contemporaneous with the appearance of the Treaty of Verdun (843), which is regarded as marking the rise of modern nationalities. Hitherto in Western Europe there had been many tentative efforts by the new races to establish stable, enduring governments, and their failure had been followed at last by a great monarchy or empire under Charlemagne which called itself Roman. When the empire of Charlemagne went down, the day was dawning amid storms and confusion which was to witness the birth of the nations. The national motive tended to neutralize the influence of the Forged Decretals. Instead of putting themselves under papal protection and control, as the Forged Decretals invited them to do, the bishops are henceforth seen gravitating toward the support of the nationality and of the king as its representative. Since it was necessary and inevitable that they should come under some control, they preferred the national alliance, under the will of the sovereign, to that of the papacy. In all this, the bishops appear again as following a tendency inherent in the office which they held, which was visible in the episcopate from the second century and more plainly evident in the fourth century, when they gladly entered into alliance with the state under Constantine. Hence also, in the Eastern church, nationality had become the recognized principle of the ecclesiastical organization, the bishops were its supporters, the depositary of the national consciousness in dark hours until the moment should come for its assertion.

The episcopate in its origin, as has been shown, was not primarily a ministry of the Word, but rather a ministry of the tables, and it rose from the supervision of the worship and the financial responsibility for the local church to the larger administration of the diocese, with a superintendence of the parish clergy. Its conservative tendency as an office and its administrative efficiency had been originally developed in the controversies with Gnosticism and Montanism,

when it was called on to resist a one-sided intellectualism on the one hand and on the other an exaggerated spiritual aspiration. The intellectual ambition of which Gnosticism was the manifestation, and the effort to fulfil the counsels of spiritual perfection, together with the desire for individual freedom represented by Montanism, had at last found a congenial resort in the monastery after they had been discouraged or made impossible in the Catholic church. In the Eastern church, however, where monasticism assumed a more contemplative character than in the West and had in consequence no history or development, the efficiency of the episcopate had been reduced by the requirement that the bishops should be taken from the monastery. But in Western Christendom the episcopate appeared throughout the Middle Ages as preserving more distinctly its original character, and, in its own manner, fulfilling its mission to the world.

As we study the place of the bishops in Mediæval history, it may be discerned as one great part of their mission to meet the sentiment and existing culture of the great mass of Christian people to whom an experimental knowledge of the Christian faith or its inward appropriation would have been an impossible or unwelcome task; and especially to adjust the Christian faith to the apprehension of kings and princes to whom the deeper insight into the inward life of the Spirit was as yet impossible, who were absorbed in the great world of human and secular affairs, and to whom Christianity must be presented as not making too radical exactions upon the conscience, or requiring too much time or effort of the spiritual imagination in order to feel its message or obey its demands. Here lay the work of the bishops in the Middle Ages, to represent Christianity in sober practical fashion to a world with but little direct capacity for religious things, which, if religion were made too high or difficult or too contradictory to the natural human moods of the soul, could not have been retained under its control. Hence the worship of the church by which Christianity most directly exerted a powerful influence over a rude and barbarous age, that

worship whose control was also still in the hands of the bishop as in ancient times, was in some way rendered attractive and intelligible to the common people, without requiring any personal effort in its participation (the *opus operatum*). Such was the view of St. Bernard of Clairvaux, who claimed for himself and the monastery the privilege of a higher worship, calling for constant effort on the part of the worshipper to rise to its demands, while he recognized that the bishop had another and no less important task. He comments upon the circumstance that men will "flock in crowds to kiss the decorated images of saints; they are enchained by their admiration of the beautiful more than by reverence for the saints. The bishops were obliged to let themselves down to the different degrees of culture among the men whom they had to deal with; to them, therefore, he conceded the right of employing such sensuous means to excite the devotion of the sensuous multitude. But it was otherwise with the monks, who, dead to the sensible world, ought no longer to need such outward means of excitement, but should strive rather to reach the ideal of the purely spiritual worship of God."[1]

It belongs to the nature of the administration of ecclesiastical affairs with which the bishop was invested, that it is closely related to, if indeed it can be separated in principle or practice from, the administration of affairs in the secular world. The bishop naturally sympathized with the state in its attempt to build up a strong government, in so far as it was a practical feasible purpose, or reflected the popular mood. He was also connected with the state by other ties; especially by the large landed property, which constituted the revenue of his see, and which he administered with a skill and success which the secular nobility could not attain. It had fallen to his lot also to become an administrator of justice, and to cultivate the judicial faculty. When his office had expanded from the simpler oversight of the local church into the ruler of a large diocese, he had acquired a deeper sense of responsi-

[1] Neander, *Ch. His.*, VII., p. 367 (Bohn ed.), and Bernard, *Epis.* iv. 17; vi. 3.

bility, as he was also regarded with a greater reverence than the secular nobility, inasmuch as the bishop represented two worlds rather than one,—the world which now is, as well as that which is to come. As in the monastery the ruling idea was the worthlessness of this present evil world, so beneath the bishop's attitude there lay the tacit assumption of the sacredness of the secular life. For these reasons, the bishops tended to become the allies of the kings, their best advisers, the strongest supporters of the authority of the crown. The kings could trust the bishops, not fearing their rivalry, when they could not always rely upon the disinterested support of the feudal nobility. The king's purpose commanded the respect of the bishops and ministered to the welfare of the church as the bishops conceived it, and the bishop was therefore working for the church when making possible the success of the state.

Had the patriarchal system as it prevailed in the Eastern church been adopted in Western Europe from the time of its conversion, it would seem as if the growth of nations might have been facilitated and those evil consequences avoided which have retarded the European nationalities in their advance toward freedom and independence. But it must be remembered also that the Eastern patriarchates of Constantinople or Alexandria or Antioch were not a creation of councils or the result of any formal or artificial attempt to give unity to the hierarchy, but were rather spontaneous growths which Councils recognized and approved. From the Eastern point of view, there was a national patriarch in Rome, but beyond that fact, the vision of the ancient General Councils, which summed up the ecclesiastical wisdom of the Catholic church in the fourth and fifth centuries, did not penetrate. In the metropolitan sees of Ravenna and Canterbury, Mainz and Rheims, there were displayed germinal tendencies toward national primacy and rivalry with Rome, which the papacy ultimately overcame. Had Pope Gregory the Great, when England was converted, recognized a patriarchate in Canterbury, and authorized a translation of the sacred books and

the offices of the church into the vernacular, he would have followed the precedent and the methods which Constantinople had approved when the conversion took place of the Slavic peoples in the East. If France and Germany, as they began slowly to realize their national distinctness, could have been aided in the process of national development by primates who would have stood for the national as well as the religious consciousness, some of the calamities of their later history might have been prevented.

But such speculative reconstructions of history have no other value than to afford a contrast to that which actually took place. The bishop of Rome, who took his first vague step in the darkness without realizing its consequences for the papal supremacy, had no desire or intention that England should form an independent branch of the Catholic church, whose patriarch should stand on an equality with himself. Tentative suggestions of such a system for France and Germany appear dimly in the dreams of the imagination of the age; but they came to nothing through the opposition of Rome, which conceived of Western Europe as an ecclesiastical empire under one head, with one common language for the expression of its law and its worship. If this may seem like an act of usurpation, or a defiance of the national purpose, yet there are points of view from which the action of Rome seems justifiable in the light of later history, in line with a divine providence watching over the order of events. It was the result of a natural contempt for the barbarian utterance and its imperfect tongues, which made Rome unwilling that the now sacred Latin should be abandoned for the uncertainties and divisions which the variety of languages would create, a repetition of what happened at Babel, when the Lord came down and confounded the speech of the peoples. It is doubtful whether vernaculars would have gained by this artificial stimulus or whether the national literatures would have had so rich a development. The "longer infancy" in Western Christendom may have contributed to a more solid enduring growth, the vernaculars slowly perfecting themselves until by their own force they should break the un-

natural bondage in which they were held. And again, to have mapped out the nationalities of Europe in advance would have been like an attempt to anticipate the divine will on the part of the papacy, far worse than any usurpation of which she has been accused. It was the good fortune of Western Christendom, not only that it was left to subdivide into states in its own way and as the result of actual experience, but also that in so doing it encountered the opposition of an imperial principle in Rome, against which it hurled itself in severe and long-continued struggles until the sacredness of nationality had been vindicated, and it became a richer and more sure possession than it could otherwise have been.

Two centuries had gone by since the attempt had been made in the Forged Decretals to detach the bishop from secular interference and control. The object of this and kindred documents may not have directly contemplated the advancement of the papacy to ecclesiastical supremacy, but that was their tendency and ultimate result. They established a presumption and a precedent in behalf of Rome, which worked like a slow leaven in the intervening period until Hildebrand came with a more definite purpose and a clearer conception of the methods to be used in order to the establishment of the papal see as the supreme authority over the princes as well as bishops, over the state as well as the church. To subordinate nationality to a spiritual imperialism was the aim of Hildebrand, — a monk bred in the cloister, who, inheriting the monastic ideal that the spiritual man should despise and reject the world, came forth to rule the world which he condemned. He affords the highest illustration of the alliance between the papacy and the monastery which constituted the leading feature of the Mediæval church. Gregory the Great had been likewise a monk, who looked on the world of secular interests with a conviction of its utter insignificance, when compared with the importance of the church as a divine institution for human salvation. This first alliance had been cemented and strengthened by another monk, Boniface the Apostle of Germany, who had con-

ceived the plan of subjecting the episcopate to the papacy. Hildebrand was the culmination of the ideal monastic ambition to subordinate the temporal to the spiritual, and to gain the control of human affairs for those who regarded this world as dross compared with the interests of eternity.

The obstacles in Hildebrand's way, which must be overcome before he could attain his purpose, were the rising nationalities, which by the eleventh century had assumed their outlines, though very far as yet from having attained the sense of national unity and independence. Wherever he looked, in England, France, or Germany, he saw that the incipient nationality was building upon the church, using the church through the bishops as the means of accomplishing its destiny. The custom had become universal for the king or sovereign to invest the bishop with the insignia of authority, the ring and the staff, and to receive an oath of homage or fealty from the bishops as the condition of their investiture. Nor do the bishops appear any longer as restive under this arrangement, but rather as if they had at last found in the state the divinely appointed supplement to their authority. The natural bent of the episcopate would have apparently rendered it content with this adjustment, had not the papacy interfered.

But Hildebrand stigmatized this arrangement by one of the darkest words in the ecclesiastical vocabulary. It appeared to him as nothing else than the sin of simony, as when Peter said to Simon Magus, "Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God might be purchased with money." No doubt the buying and selling of ecclesiastical offices, especially of the great sees and abbacies, was a sin and temptation of the age, and indeed it remained the characteristic vice of the Middle Ages under the later régime of the popes, not ceasing until at the Reformation the church was purified, yet so as by fire. But Hildebrand did not understand simony to mean exclusively or primarily the buying and selling of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, which were supposed to be vested in

the ecclesiastical offices. It was simony in his eyes if the secular authority demanded allegiance of the bishop or clothed him with the power of ruling in his temporal domain. Before the spiritual freedom of the church could be realized in the papacy as its head, the bishops must be detached from that dependence on the secular power which the secular investiture involved.

The Investiture Controversy is alluded to here only for the purpose of illustrating the attitude of the bishops. In every case, they stood by the sovereign at the moment when Hildebrand precipitated the conflict. They were loyal to William the Conqueror in England, to Philip I. in France, and to Henry IV. in Germany. Hildebrand was discreet with the wisdom of the serpent, when he chose Germany as the field in which he proposed that the battle should be fought. Henry IV. was not strong in the support of his great feudal lords when Hildebrand attacked him, but he did have the sympathy and countenance of the bishops. It was only after it had become apparent that the king could not hold his own in the unequal struggle with Hildebrand, that the bishops yielded, and went over to the side that seemed the stronger. The result might not have been the same in other countries, had Hildebrand chosen to make the issue there. Germany was not only weak because of the disaffection of its secular nobles toward the king, but in Germany also the antecedents of the episcopate had been from the first, since Boniface parcelled out the territory among them, more closely related to papal authority and more deeply affected by papal prestige than in France or in England.

The case of Anselm in England, as Archbishop of Canterbury († 1109), fighting for the papal principle in the wars of the Investiture Controversy against his sovereign, is another illustration of the natural sympathy of the bishops as allied with the cause of nationality. Anselm also was a monk, deeply imbued with the monastic ideal; but even under so bad a king as William Rufus, who was sinning against the church by refusing to fill the bishopric

in order to appropriate to himself their revenues, — even under such a king, immoral and vicious, the sympathy of the bishops was not with Anselm, but with the sovereign, as their divinely ordered leader, and they left Anselm to fight his battles alone. Anselm was at last defeated, because in doctrinaire, monastic fashion he pushed the issue to such an extent as to refuse to take the oath of allegiance. But in one respect he was victorious, in the change which was wrought in England, in consequence of his struggles, by which the order of making a bishop was changed. Before his time the investiture by the king came first, and when homage had been rendered, and he had been clothed with the symbols of authority, he received his spiritual qualification by consecration. Since then, the order has been reversed, as it is fitting that it should be; the spiritual qualification is followed by the secular, and the king's recognition subordinated to the ecclesiastical rite.[1]

It is generally said that the controversy over investiture which Hildebrand began ended in a compromise, in which the church gained more than the state. So, indeed, it must have seemed during the period of two centuries which intervened between Hildebrand and the time of Boniface VIII., — the period when the papacy was at the height of its power. But during this age of papal supremacy, when the popes began to claim the right of appointment to all the more important or richer benefices, as the trustees of all ecclesiastical property, it was becoming apparent that those states had made the longest strides toward nationality in which the power of the popes over the bishops was kept in check by the king. This was the case more particularly in France and England, where episcopal elections were more free, or required the confirmation of the king. During this period it began to be assumed as the ground of the papal prerogative, though it was never formulated as a law or dogmatically asserted as a principle beyond dispute, that the bishops reigned no longer by the immediate grace of God, but by the mediat-

[1] Cf. Freeman, *Reign of William Rufus*, Vol. I., c. 4.

ing will of the pope.[1] The Cyprianic theory of the episcopate, that each bishop was dependent on the divine law, to which alone he was responsible, grew weak as the papacy grew stronger on the one hand, or the power of the priesthood on the other. That the episcopate constituted an order distinct from the priesthood, was not the prevailing doctrine; the bishop was primarily a priest with certain special functions attached, which constituted his distinction. The papacy itself was essentially changed from its original character as the bishopric of Rome. Under the influence of the two powerful sentiments with which it was allied, monasticism and ancient imperial Rome, the office had been so transformed that its early origin was with difficulty realized by the Christian imagination. The institution of cardinals eclipsed every other distinction in the church, tending to depreciate the dignity of the episcopate by creating a higher ambition than the episcopate could gratify. Even a presbyter or priest, when vested with the cardinal's hat, took precedence in the rank of the hierarchy over bishops who had not attained that honor.

But amid these depressing circumstances the episcopate was fulfilling its natural functions, which appear more rational and humane, more favorable to the higher civili-

[1] Cf. Aquinas, *Sent.*, Lib. II., *Dist.* 44, *Qu.* 2: "Potestas superior et inferior dupliciter possent se habere. Aut ita, quod inferior potestas ex toto oriatur a superiori; et tunc tota virtus inferioris fundatur supra virtutem superioris, et tunc simpliciter et in omnibus est magis obediendum potestati superiori, quam inferiori: et sic se habet potestas Dei ad omnem potestatem creatam; sic etiam se habet potestas Imperatoris ad potestatem proconsulis: sic etiam se habet potestas Papae ad omnem spiritualem potestatem in Ecclesia; quia ab ipso Papa gradus dignitatum diversi in Ecclesia et disponuntur et ordinantur; unde ejus potestas est quoddam Ecclesiae fundamentum, ut patet Matth. xvi. Et ideo in omnibus magis tenemur obedire Papae quam Episcopis, vel Archiepiscopis, vel Monachus Abbati absque ulla distinctione. Potest iterum potestas superior et inferior ita se habere, quod ambae oriantur ex una quadam suprema potestate: et hoc modo se habent potestates et Episcopi et Archiepiscopi descendentes a Papae potestate. Papa utriusque potestatis apicem tenet, scilicet spiritualis et saecularis." Also *Sent.*, Lib. IV., *Dist.* 20, *Art.* 4, *Solutio* 3: "Papa habet plentitudinem pontificalis potestatis, quasi Rex in regno: sed Episcopi assumuntur in partem solicitudinis, quasi judices singulis civitatibus praepositi."

zation and freedom, as well as more truly religious, than the fierce and bitter conflicts into which the papacy was plunging. It is a characteristic of the episcopate as a whole that, when the papal church rose up in its angry might to suppress the ecclesiastical sects which had been multiplying rapidly in the twelfth century while popes were preoccupied with other interests, the bishops did not make the best inquisitors in the search for heresy. From the point of view of ecclesiastical order, it was they who should have taken steps for the defence of the faith, of which they were the guardians, each in his own jurisdiction; and the papacy in its first attempts to suppress the heretical sects had evidently relied on them as the agents to carry out its purpose. The episcopal synodal courts were charged by Pope Lucius III., in 1184, with the duty of exterminating heresy, and bishops who neglected their tasks were threatened with deposition. But for some reason the bishops failed to do what was expected of them, they were inactive or indifferent, or they may have been preoccupied with other affairs. They had not yet risen, it is true, to the higher conception of religious tolerance, and if their own prerogatives had been at stake, they might have been found eager to defend them at any cost. But it is possible also that the humane features of the episcopal office indisposed them to take the lead in the cruelties which were to be inflicted on those who had the right to look to them for protection. Whatever explanation may be assigned for their inactivity, it is clear that the papacy could not depend on them, or it would not have turned elsewhere for the materials out of which to create the tribunals of inquisition. Again it was the monks, and in close alliance with the papacy, by whom the supreme effort was made to exterminate heresy in the thirteenth century, — the Cistercians at first and finally the Dominicans, on whom Pope Innocent the Great (1190–1216), and after him Gregory IX. (1232), relied in their determination to accomplish their awful purpose, the execution of which forms one of the most fearful chapters in the annals of human history. Nothing that took place in

the persecution of the Christians under Roman Emperors can compare in severity and cruelty and inhumanity, or as to the number of victims involved, with what was achieved by the Tribunals of Inquisition for the suppression of heresy. Nor was it from the bishops that the enunciation came of the principles by which the process of extermination was justified. It was a Dominican monk, St. Thomas Aquinas, the leading theologian of his age, who taught that "Heresy is a sin worthy of death, falsification of the faith worse than false coining, and deserving not merely exclusion from the church, but also from the world."[1]

Among the impressive contrasts of history must be noted the circumstance that the blow to the papacy from which it never recovered, the beginning indeed of its downfall, came from that country where the papal tenderness of conscience and solicitude for the faith had found its chief occasion and manifestation. In the extermination of the Albigenses, an evil principle was introduced into the French national temperament, which has been the precursor of other similar events in the later history of France. But the immediate effect of this massacre of a large part of the population of France with the sanction of the papacy, was to strengthen the French monarchy, to whom the vacant territory of the Albigenses reverted. It seems, therefore, like an act of condign retribution, that when the national sentiment in France had attained sufficient vigor to enable the nation to realize its unity as a whole, its first act should have been one of defiance toward the papacy. The story is familiar and need not be repeated. The significance of the conflict between Philip the Fair of France and Pope Boniface VIII. consists in this, that it was the first of a series of national protests which did not cease until the nations of Western Europe had accomplished their emancipation from external interference, whether ecclesiastical or imperial, and the modern world was born in which the nations stand in their freedom and independence before God, answerable only to

[1] Cf. Moeller, *Ch. His.*, II. 402.

God and the people. Whatever may have been the deficiency of the episcopate in the crusade against French heretics from the papal point of view, they were not lacking in devotion to the French crown, in the long and fierce contention between the pope and the king. They had their reprisals at last, after ages of subjection, and although the French monarchy was afterwards checked and inwardly hurt by sinister events in its history, yet for what it did achieve it was, in large measure, indebted to an episcopate which supported the sovereign and was protected by him, which defied the papal ban and interdict, demonstrating that against the spirit of a united nation, realizing its call from God, no earthly weapons can prosper. With the conflict between Philip and Boniface, at the beginning of the fourteenth century when the papacy was defeated, begins a new chapter in human history. Every leading event from that time until the Reformation tended to the diminution of papal power over church and state, and also to the reduction of its ally, the monastic orders, to impotence and decay.

It is one of the revelations of history that the seeming appearance of things does not correspond to the reality. The great institutions of the Middle Ages — the Papacy, Monasticism, and the Scholasticism which was the product of the monastic spirit, are indeed the manifestation of a life, and represent a stage in the progress of humanity. And yet they were not finalities in themselves, but rather temporary agencies which were to be done away in the fulness of time. Beneath the surface of Mediæval institutions a mightier task was in process of accomplishment, which did not appear as the supreme issue of history until it was ripe for its manifestation. The building up of the nation then began to be revealed as the goal of history,[1]

[1] Cf. Mulford, *The Nation*, cc. xix., xx. The Book of Revelation, which affirms the undying life of the nations and their sacredness before God, invoking the destruction of Rome for its sins against the nations, fell into disrepute after the union of the Catholic church with the Roman Empire. In the Middle Ages, so strong was the contrast between its assertion of nationality and the existing situation in which empire was

and in the independence and freedom of the nation through the consciousness of its divine calling, the church was to find its largest opportunity. To this work the episcopate contributed so directly, that without its aid the great result might not have been achieved. To support kings, and inspire them with a sense of the divineness of their vocation, was one part of the bishop's work. But they mediated also between the kings and the people. "Whatever their class interests may from time to time have led them to do, let it be remembered that they existed as a permanent mediating authority between the rich and the poor, the strong and the weak, and that, to their eternal honor, they fully comprehended and performed the duties of this most noble position. To none but themselves would it have been permitted to stay the strong hand of power, to mitigate the just severity of the law, to hold out a glimmering of hope to the serf, to find a place in this world and a provision for the destitute, whose existence the state did not recognize."[1]

The bishops represented what in the language of the Middle Ages was known as the 'secular' form of Christianity, while the monastic clergy stood for another type which was designated as 'religious.' The tendency of the age was to depreciate the secular as compared with the religious. The alliance of the papacy with monasticism was more intimate and genuine than with the episcopate. It tolerated the existence of nations as necessary evils in the one family of Christendom. "Herein," says Maurice, "lay the great contradiction of the Mediæval Church, that which produced its monstrous corruptions. It thought that it could exist without distinct Nations, that its calling was to overthrow the Nations. Therefore the great virtues which Nations foster, Distinct Individual Conscience, Sense of personal responsibility, Veracity, Loyalty, were under-

the ideal, that it required, says Renan, feats of exegetical power to overcome the difficulties which it created. Cf. *L'Antichrist*, c. xviii.

[1] Kemble, *Saxons in England*, II., p. 375; for the relations between the king and the English bishops, cf. Freeman, *Reign of William Rufus*, I., c. iv.

mined by it; therefore it called good evil and evil good; therefore it mimicked the Nations while it was trampling upon them; therefore it became more bloodthirsty than any Nation had ever been."[1]

In behalf of these virtues the bishops stood, when they may have seemed only subservient to the whims and passions of a sovereign. They were to the king a constant reminder of the kingdom of God, in which the state had its root and from which it drew its authority. If they did not aim so high as the monastery, nor seek to enforce the so-called counsels of perfection, nor identify Christianity with some one aspect or theory of its nature, yet none the less was their work a vital one for the interests of the Christian life. The spirit of the episcopate, as it has been called, may be traced in the parish churches scattered over all Europe, whose well-being it was their duty to promote, by careful and loving superintendence. In these religious homes of the common people of every grade, as well as of the nobility, we must suppose, despite all the irregularity or indifference or neglect which may have existed, that the essentials of the Christian faith were maintained and

[1] *Social Morality*, p. 180.

"La papauté est, par sa nature même, un danger pour l'indépendance des nations. Chaque nation est souveraine dans les limites de son territoire, peu importe par qui cette souveraineté est exercée. Or la souveraineté implique le droit de régler les intérêts spirituels aussi bien que les intérêts temporels. Mais comment ce droit s'exercera-t-il, s'il y a au-dessus des nations un pouvoir qui a le droit de leur commander, non seulement dans les matières purement spirituelles, mais encore dans les affaires temporelles, quand il plaît à ce pouvoir de déclarer que la religion y est intéressée? Indépendance nationale et papauté sont donc deux choses incompatibles. Si le pape a la plénitude de la puissance spirituelle, les nations cessent d'être souveraines; si les nations veulent être souveraines, la papauté devient impossible. Cela est si vrai que la papauté ne serait pas parvenue à s'établir si, dans les premiers siècles de son existence, elle avait eu en face d'elle des nations fortement constituées. L'institution de la papauté remonte à la dissolution du monde romain. Or sous l'empire, il n'y avait plus de nations; Rome eut la fatale puissance d'absorber les vaincus et de détruire leur génie individuel. Les Barbares apportèrent le germe de nouvelles nationalités, mais il leur fallut des siècles pour se développer; c'est le lent travail du moyen âge. Dans son origine, la papauté n'avait donc pas à lutter contre les nations, car elles n'existaient pas" (Laurent, *His. de l'Humanité*, VI., p. 326).

Christian morality inculcated. As the monasteries sought to invade the sphere of the secular church, the bishops resisted their encroachments in the interest of a simpler, more practical, and more comprehensive estimate of the religion of Christ. A recent writer has thus characterized this feature of the work of the bishops: "The episcopate represents the Christianity of history; it represents, further, the Christianity of the general church, as distinguished from the special opinions and views of doctrine which assert their claims in it. Its long lines tie together the Christian body in time; they are scarcely less a bond, connecting the infinite moral and religious differences which must always be in the body of the church. The bishop's office embodies and protects the large public idea of religion, the common belief and understanding; that which all, more or less, respond to, and recognize as neither of this party nor of that, and allow a place to, even if not personally satisfied with it."[1]

The Council of Constance, which met in the year 1414, may be taken as the total picture of the outcome of the Middle Ages. If the church of the Eastern Empire could have taken part in its deliberations, it would have been a picture of a united Christendom. As it was, it represented the Latin church on the eve of its disruption, bringing as it were before God and the world the fruit of its labors for nearly a thousand years. The pope and the emperor were there, princes also, ambassadors, and the secular nobility. The rival forms of Christianity, the secular church represented by the episcopate, and the monastery represented by the presbyter-abbots, appeared there on an equal footing. The learning of the age was also recognized as a constituent factor of the Council in the large representation of the teachers or doctors of theology. So far as numbers went, it was the most impressive Council in Christian history. The ancient General Councils, which allowed only the bishops to vote, reckoned their attend-

[1] Church, R. W., on *The Place of the Episcopate in Christian History* in *Pascal and Other Sermons*, New York, 1895.

ance by the hundreds; at the Council of Constance the number of clergy is estimated at eighteen thousand.[1]

The actual result of Mediæval development is revealed at this Council in contrast with the external appearance of things, as it strikes the eye looking only to the visible framework of the social organism. It was not the papacy or the Holy Roman Empire which was the deepest ground on which the authority of the Council reposed, but the national idea, now for the first time in the Western church recognized as the divine basis for ecclesiastical organization. The deliberations of the Council were first held in separate national conclaves, and the final vote was taken by nations. "When it was proposed to vote by nations," says Milman, "the decree to that effect, against which the pope remonstrated, was passed with irresistible acclamation."

But the Council of Constance is chiefly to be remembered for the conviction which it uttered, in the realization of its own greatness, that a power had risen at last in Latin Christendom, which was higher than the papacy. "The universal church," said Cardinal D'Ailly, "represented by a general council, has full power to depose even a lawful pontiff of blameless character, if it be necessary for the welfare of the church." In accordance with this principle, it deposed one pope and elected another. Although the Council was still loyal, in theory at least, to the papacy, even allowing its proposed reforms to be thwarted by its adherence to the idea that before proceeding to a reformation a pope should be elected; yet its final result was to weaken, if not destroy, the prestige of Rome. From this time the papal ecclesiastical supremacy may be said to have

[1] "The total number of Clergy, not perhaps all present at one time, was four Patriarchs, Constantinople, Grado, Antioch, Aquileia; twenty-nine Cardinals, Italians by birth, excepting five Frenchmen, chiefly of the creation of Benedict XIII., and one Portuguese; thirty-three Archbishops; about one hundred and fifty Bishops, including thirty-two titulars; one hundred and thirty-four Abbots; two hundred and fifty Doctors; one hundred and twenty-five Provosts, and other superiors. With their whole attendance the Clergy amounted to eighteen thousand" (Milman, *Lat. Chris.*, VII., p. 452).

come to an end; for never afterward was the papacy able to address itself with a voice of authority to Western Christendom. But the great defect and failure of the council was not so much in its inability to carry reforms in head and members, as in the fatal limitation of its vision by which it could not see the imperative necessity of including within the church universal a Wycliffe or a Huss. It had not the prophetic gift to recognize the new age that was dawning, or the power of suppressed spiritual forces which were threatening a revolution. When the papacy finally lost its last lingering hold over the sentiment of Europe, as was made evident in the throes of the sixteenth century, these forces were set free to rebuild and reorganize in their own way. The episcopate and the presbyterate, or the ruling ideas for which they stood, had no longer any organic external tie which should bind them together, as the bishop and the monastery had been held together in the Middle Ages. But a larger fellowship and a deeper and more real organic bond of unity existed which could not be broken, an invisible Headship of the church under whose presence and authority the seemingly shattered fragments of Catholic Christendom were still united, as when Gerson, the leader of the council, proclaimed that Christ Himself was the primal and perfect Head of the church whose union with His church was alone indissoluble.[1]

This was the conviction which inspired and sustained the Protestant reformers of the sixteenth century, whether in England or Germany or Switzerland, that Christ had now as it were resumed His own headship of the church without the mediation of any earthly vicars; and in this most real of all bonds of organization, the Catholic or universal church was held in actual and living unity.

[1] Von der Hardt, *Concil. Const.*, I., pp. 76 ff.; Gerson, *Opera*, II., p. 162; cf. Gieseler, *Ec. His.*, III., pp. 221 ff., for the larger conception of the Catholic church which was rising in Gerson's mind, — the abandonment of Catholicity as defined by Hildebrand: *Quod catholicus non habeatur, qui non concordat Romanae ecclesiae. Dictat. Hildeb.*, in Jaffé, *Bib. Rer. Ger.*, II. 174.

CHAPTER XII

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCHES IN THE AGE OF THE REFORMATION

THE age of the Reformation was a period of changes and adjustments, demanded and made possible by the revolution which had been in process during the two hundred years which went before. In that revolution the power of the papacy had been overthrown, and the Holy Roman Empire had been dissolved. The revolt of Luther and of Henry VIII. only made apparent that which in reality had been accomplished by the generations which had preceded them. The changes of the sixteenth century were so vital for the interests of Christendom, that in the popular judgment they have been too closely identified with the agencies by which the Mediæval fabric was undone. To correct so misleading an interpretation of history is one of the duties which calls for the labors of the historian. There came in the latter half of the fifteenth century an age of apparent repose, a lull, as it were, after the storm, which seemed like a return to the normal order, political or ecclesiastical. If one dwells on this moment in the history, it almost appears as if councils had failed or the protest of kings had led to no result. From this point of view the Reformers of the sixteenth century have been represented as self-willed agitators who were unnecessarily disturbing the peace of society.[1]

The papacy had begun to lose its supremacy over the

[1] Such is the attitude of Janssen, in his learned and able, but wholly misleading treatment of the German Reformation, — *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters.* For the literature of the German and Swiss Reformations, cf. Schaff, in *Church History*, Vols. VI., VII. See also Fisher, *His. of the Reformation.*

states of Europe, after Philip the Fair had defied Pope Boniface VIII., when papal interdicts and bulls of excommunication proved inefficient. The silent change which robbed the papal weapons of their power was the development of the national consciousness. Philip led in the revolt, and Germany followed, declaring in the Golden Bull of 1356 that the German emperor was made by the vote of the electors and not by the papal will. England contributed Wycliffe to the process by which nations asserted their autonomy. In the Reformatory Councils of the fifteenth century, the assertion of the principle that the authority of the council was superior to the pope had broken down the ecclesiastical supremacy of the popes over the churches. Men thought the councils were a failure, while in reality they had done a work too great for the imagination at once to receive. When a General Council had deposed a pope and elected his successor, a new authority had risen and been recognized in Christendom, and the old authority had passed away. With the passing of the papacy, the Holy Roman Empire had also disappeared. That too had been overcome by the sentiment of nationality. These things should be borne in mind in estimating the work of the Reformers. They are charged with breaking up the unity of Christendom, but what they really did was to respond to the demand for changes, after the old order had already become powerless. But it must be also said that the papacy did not realize the extent of the revolution, until the changes were actually undertaken which were demanded by the new order.

It sometimes looks as if the varied forms of ecclesiastical life which appeared in the age of the Reformation were accidental or purposeless. But the deeper study of the peculiarities of the reformed churches shows that in every case they were following some law of development, some deep inward principle, which had its roots in the national life, whose growth was determined by political and geographical as well as by religious motives. The divine purpose in history was manifested in the age of the Reformation no less than in the ancient church when

other and different motives had been the ruling ideas of history. As in the ancient church, so also in the age of the Reformation, world-forces were in operation for the production of results, and not in any case the mere whim of an individual man.

In the age of the Reformation, the Catholic church, with its distinctive products, came up for review before the new tribunals, submitting its institutions, its organization, its discipline, its cultus, and its doctrine to the requirements of an advancing Christian civilization. It was assumed with unanimity in this new age that there was something higher than Catholic tradition, in the light of which it must be judged. The appeal was to be taken, not exclusively to the fathers or to the General Council of the Catholic church, but to the voice of that earlier church which spoke in the pages of the New Testament.

The Reformers were not aiming at external ecclesiastical unity, as the founders of the Catholic church had done in the second and third centuries. They were more in sympathy with the principle which the ancient church of the East had followed, when it rejected the papal claim to supremacy, together with the Latin doctrine that Catholic unity consisted in homogeneousness of organization under the supreme authority of one man. Emerging as the Reformers did from the authority of Rome, which had maintained a certain formal unity in Western Christendom under an ecclesiastical imperialism, there was no confusion in their vision regarding the value of that unity, nor any disposition to preserve it. The unity of the Mediæval church had not been achieved by any principle of inward reconciliation between conflicting tendencies, and it had been finally driven to the use of force in order to its perpetuation. From the time that the inquisition had been found necessary to maintain the ecclesiastical hegemony of Rome, the change had begun which was to substitute some other conception of Christian unity. The Reformers had another ideal, the vision of a higher unity of the Spirit, which bound

men together in the church which was invisible. That unity, as they believed, was more real than any scheme of visible homogeneous organization, because it existed in the divine mind, to be reproduced in this lower world. It was a unity which could not be broken by the changes and vicissitudes incident to human development. From this point of view the Reformers were not dividing Christendom in the reorganization of the churches, but rather consolidating a higher unity, which time would reveal.

I

The Mediæval church was the resultant of two tendencies or phases of the Christian spirit, whose opposition had been held in check by the papacy,— the ancient Catholic church, whose ecclesiastical organization had been completed, and whose central doctrine had been formulated in the age of Constantine, and monasticism, a church within a church, with a different descent and another aim. The one had sought to bind men together in organic unity, to offer a common worship and a common salvation, wherein the burden was transferred from the people to a priesthood who mediated in their behalf before God; the other asserted the responsibility of the individual soul before God, to such an extent that at first it felt no dependence upon a common worship, but drove men into the deserts, where they might atone for sins and seek the individual assurance of union and peace with God.

In the Eastern church there came no development to these divergent forms of apprehending the mission of Christ. But in the West each had its history, there was conflict between them,— the secular church represented by the episcopate, and the monastery by the presbyterate. The tendency of the one was to consolidate the state, to minister to national unity and independence, to guard the religious and moral welfare of the great mass of the people, perpetuating its spirit in the parish churches scattered over the length and breadth of Western Christendom. Monasticism, on the other hand, retained through

all its changes the spirit in which it originated, offering a refuge to men and women in their individual capacity, who were seeking to satisfy some personal need or inward aspiration. It included elect souls who sought the honors of saintship, for election was always the monastic principle; and the monk felt a personal call or vocation which could not find a sphere in the secular church. The greatness and the wisdom of the papacy lay in the reconciliation of these divergent aims. It was in sympathy with both, and never entirely identified with either. Thus there arose a new conception of catholicity to which the Eastern church was a stranger; a new definition was given of the Catholic church, by Hildebrand in the so-called *Dictatus*, where it is affirmed that no one is a Catholic who is not in agreement with the Roman church, — *Quod catholicus non habeatur, qui non concordat Romanae ecclesiae.* This conviction has been the soul of Roman catholicity. It has been a conviction, also, which has been enforced in great results, so that from the time of Hildebrand any tendency on the part of the episcopate toward the formation of an independent national church was resisted, and for a time overcome, not only by the subjection of the episcopate to the papacy, as in the formal vow of its consecration, but by subjecting also the states of Europe themselves to the civil supremacy of the Roman pontiff. As a means also to this end, the monasteries were detached from the jurisdiction of the bishops, and bound in close, direct dependence upon the papacy, becoming its agents and representatives everywhere and allowed free scope for their peculiar development. Despite the rivalry and hostility between the secular and the religious clergy, there grew up strong ties holding them together in seemingly organic relationship. Great as were the concessions made by the papacy to the monastery, as when it gave the title of prelate to prominent heads of monastic houses or invested them with the mitre as the symbol of episcopal authority, yet it never conceded what the episcopate claimed as its distinctive right, — the power of ordination. The presbyterate and

episcopate were equalized as far as possible, but the bishop still remained in possession of an authority which was his before the monastery arose.

But no scheme, however wise or subtly adapted to existing conditions, is able to control the laws of human development. Already it was evident before the Reformers appeared that the world had not been moving in accordance with the ecclesiastical constitution of the Mediæval church. At the Council of Constance, it was manifest that these two tendencies, the secular church and the episcopate on the one hand, and the monastic church governed by the presbyterate, on the other, had not been wholly fused into one; that with the decline of the papacy, or its continued inability to enforce its will, they were standing forth in characteristic independence, ready for any emergency which might befall. The prerogatives of the bishops by divine right were there reasserted; the time, it was said, had come when they should be distinguished from presbyters by something more than dress or revenue, *habitu et reditibus.*[1] But when the claims of the episcopate were boldly advanced, as by Gerson, another influential voice in the council spoke for the presbyterate. The Cardinal-Bishop of Cambray advocated the right of learned presbyters to a seat and vote in the council by the same law which gave a place to the bishop or the presbyter-abbot.[2] And other

[1] "Etenim quid hodie erant Episcopi, nisi umbrae quaedam? Quid plus illis restabat, quam baculus et mitra? Numquid pastores sine ovibus dici poterant, cum nihil in subditos statuere possent? Nempe cum esset in ecclesia primitiva episcoporum summa potestas, hodie ad id venerunt, ut solo habitu et reditibus superarent presbyteros. At nos eos in statu reposuimus pristino; nos beneficiorum collationem ad eos reduximus, nos eis confirmationem electionum restituimus, nos causas subditorum eisdem reddidimus audiendas, nos eos, qui jam non erant Episcopi, fecimus episcopos" (Cardinal Ludovicus, at Basle, where he presided, in Aeneae Sylvii *De Conc. Basil.*, Oper. I., p. 40 (ed. 1667); cited in Gieseler, III., p. 341).

[2] When the papal party at the Council of Constance wished that only the greater prelates, bishops, and abbots should have votes, it was resisted by Petrus de Alliaco, Cardinal of Cambray, who claimed the right to vote for lesser dignitaries, and especially for teachers of theology: "Quibus, et maxime Theologis, datur auctoritas praedicandi aut docendi ubique

voices were heard in that prophetic age, arguing for the supreme power of the bishop of Rome, as alone by divine right, from whom bishop and presbyter alike derived their authority. The Council of Constance reflected in advance the varying attitudes of the coming age. Had the nations which were there represented maintained the national principle in its integrity, some different result would have been accomplished. But they were tempted in their weakness to make separate agreements or concordats with the papacy, which so far redressed their national grievances, that the day which promised so much for national churches came to its close with diminished prospects of its attainment. It was from the monastery that the first effort proceeded which resulted in an independent Protestant church.

II

The Franciscan order appears from several points of view as the forerunner of ecclesiastical organizations which took their rise in the sixteenth century. It not only prepared the way for their appearance, but in some respects also afforded the type they were to follow. In its origin,

terrarum, quae non est parva auctoritas in populo Christiano, sed multo major quam unius Episcopi vel Abbatis ignorantis et solum titularis" (Von der Hardt, *Con. Const.*, II., pp. 224 ff.).

And to the same effect the words of Philasterius, Cardinal S. Marci: "And thou, whoever thou art, who claimest that only the greater Prelates, Bishops, and Abbots should have a voice in a General Council: and thus excludest Doctors, Archdeacons, Rectors of parochial churches, and other dignitaries to whom belongs the cure of souls, besides the ecclesiastical Orders, Priests, and Deacons, say, where do you read that these should not be admitted? And if you read the accounts of ancient councils, you will find that priests and deacons were admitted.

"If you are a Canonist, behold the text of the Canon saying that the Order of Doctors (teachers) is as if chief in the church of God. That Order, therefore, and as it were the highest order, you repel, and admit without distinction Bishops and Abbots, of whom the greater part is unlearned: Et attende, quod Rex, vel Praelatus indoctus est asinus coronatus. Cum illis ergo Doctores admitte, ut illorum scientiae defectum, qui tamen auctoritatem habent, istorum scientia et doctrina suppleant. . . . Inter episcopos et presbyteros, quantum ad ordinationem et meritum, Apostolus nullam differentiam facit" (Von der Hardt, II., p. 226).

it was a lay movement to which the ordinary features of monasticism were subordinated in order to the execution of an aim which hitherto the monastic orders had not contemplated. It passed over into a monastic order against the will of its founder, and because, if any special work were to be done within the church, the monastic organization was the only available method which the times allowed. According to the conception of St. Francis, the whole world was to be the parish in which his disciples were to labor. They were to go forth two by two, according to Christ's direction, to preach repentance and salvation, taking no money with them, but dependent on the voluntary contributions of the people. St. Francis contemplated the revival of the Apostolate, which should carry the Gospel into heathen lands, and himself set the example of a missionary tour. The order grew with astonishing rapidity, admitting priests to its membership, then under St. Clare establishing the second order, to which women were admitted, and finally creating a third associated order, the Tertiaries, as they were called, by which men and women, married and living in their homes, were entitled to membership under a special rule. Thus was afforded a wide popular basis on which the new organization reposed. The different countries of Europe were designated as its provinces, but Germany was its favorite home for missionary work. The papacy endowed it with special privileges, immunity from all episcopal jurisdiction or supervision, and permission to its clergy to preach in every land, to say Mass, or to hear confessions. The openness of the new order to all living influences of the time was one of its marked characteristics; it entered the fields of scholarship and theology; when nominalism arose, it gave to it a cordial reception, and when ecclesiastical art developed, it became its patron and formed an appreciative constituency for its appeal. And, again, it was characteristic of this order that, like the Benedictine and the Dominican, it honored its founder, and its members found nothing incongruous in being called after his name,—an analogy with some of the Protestant churches,

where the personality of some one great religious teacher is perpetuated in the popular title of recognition.

Could the Franciscan order have remained upon the foundation laid by St. Francis himself, it might have developed into an independent cosmopolitan organization, absorbing into itself the new world-forces which the age was generating. But its status as a monastic order was too definitely fixed by the bull of Pope Honorius III. in 1220. It was drawn back and compressed into the familiar mould of binding monastic vows, along with its great rival, the Dominican order, which in so many respects resembled it, and both succumbed, in the age before the Reformation, to those disintegrating influences which affect institutions that have done their work and no longer respond to the deeper needs of a growing world. But the Franciscans had weakened the secular church by their successful rivalry with the secular clergy; they had appropriated parish churches; they had cultivated preaching as an art, and were thus presenting to Christendom a new model for an ecclesiastical organization.[1]

Another and more direct preparation for the coming of the reformed churches in the sixteenth century was furnished by the Brothers of the Common Life. They were an association of clergy living under rule, but not bound by monastic vows, who established schools and devoted themselves to preaching, exerting a wide influence in the Netherlands and in Northern Germany during the fifteenth century. They were vehemently opposed by the mendicant monks, but gained the sanction for their work of the Council of Constance. In these ways the presbyterate had been asserting itself, disciplining itself also, emancipating itself from the episcopal or secular church, when Luther went forth from the cloisters of an Augustinian monastery to become the leader of an independent organization, which should assume the work of the secular church, and appropriate its property, acknowledging

[1] Sabatier, *Vie de S. François d'Assise;* Bernardin, *L'esprit de Saint François d'Assisie;* Mrs. Oliphant, *Life of St. Francis;* Müller, K., *Die Anfänge des Minoritenordens und die Bussbruderschaften.*

no jurisdiction or supervision of bishops, after having taken the momentous step of renouncing the control of the papacy.[1]

Beneath the changes which led to the reconstitution of churches in the age of the Reformation on a presbyterial basis, there lay the conviction that herein was a return to the principles and authority of Apostles as contained in the New Testament. The Canon Law had given its sanction to the statement of Jerome, which carried not only an allegation as to matters of historical fact, as that in the beginning of Christ's religion there was no difference in equality between bishops and presbyters, but had also asserted that the placing of the bishop above the presbyter was a human arrangement, required by the necessities of the time. In the sixteenth century, these human arrangements of the Mediæval church had but little weight when compared with the higher authority of Christ and His Apostles. But not only was the change in organization which rejected the episcopate thus based upon what was believed a divine right, but other revolutions were in the quiet process of accomplishment which were making such a transformation seem part of a natural, inevitable law. The priesthood which Cyprian established in the third century was returning again to the earlier conception of the presbyterate, when the cure of souls and the practice of exhortation or preach-

[1] For the extent to which the monasteries contributed to the Reformation in Germany, see Kurtz, *Ch. His.*, II., § 125 (Eng. Trans.): "The most powerful heralds of the Reformation were the monkish orders. . . . Evangelists inspired by a purer doctrine arose in all parts of Germany, first and most of all among the Augustinian order, which, almost to a man, went over to the Reformation, and had the glory of providing its first martyr. The order regarded Luther's honor as its own. Next to them came the Franciscans . . . of whom many had the courage to free themselves from their shackles. From their cloisters proceeded the two famous popular preachers, Eberlin of Günsburg, and Henry of Kettenbach in Ulm, the Hamburg reformer Stephen Kempen, the fervent Lambert, the reformer of Hesse, Luther's friend Myconius of Gotha, and many more. Other orders too supplied their contingent, even the Dominicans, to whom Martin Bucer, the Strassburg reformer, belonged. Blaurer of Württemberg was a Benedictine, Rhegius a Carmelite, Bugenhagen a Premonstratensian."

ing, together with the presbyter's ancient function as a defender of the faith, were taking the place of sacrificial rites, which during the Middle Ages had been the work of a presbyter.

The conception of priesthood had become to the Mediæval church its strongest conviction, and had indeed risen to such transcendent importance, especially after the dogma of transubstantiation had been sanctioned, that the priesthood threatened to eclipse all other spiritual distinctions. It was magnified in the monasteries, till other ranks and gradations in the hierarchy were viewed as functions of the one order of the priesthood. To offer the unbloody and stupendous sacrifice of the altar, to bring down Christ from the heavens, to keep the communication open between God and man, was a work to which administrative functions must, in theory at least, be held subordinate. But while the highest distinction of pope or prelate lay in belonging to the order of the priesthood, the bishop retained a certain ascendency by the ruling of the Canon Law, which made his participation essential to the conferring of this dignity. In the popular, as well as in the ecclesiastical, estimate, he alone gave the authority to offer the sacrifice by the sacrament of ordination, handing down the power which, according to the received view, he himself had received through his predecessors, who had in the first instance received it from Apostles, and the Apostles from Christ. According to strict theory, the sacrament of ordination, both in dignity and importance, took precedence of all other sacraments, for upon it the very existence of the church was dependent. There was a conflict here and a deep contradiction, which could not have been overcome but by another vast and silent process, which was undermining the postulates of the Mediæval church. The doctrine of transubstantiation had been first called in question by philosophical thinkers, but the doubt was rapidly spreading among the people. That doctrine, which may be called the keystone of the arch of Mediæval Christianity, could no longer be maintained, if the principles of the growing philosophy, known

as Nominalism, should gain acceptance as a substitute for the discarded realism of the Schoolmen. And this was what was coming to pass. It was becoming as difficult to believe in transubstantiation, as formerly it had been impossible to resist it. It was ceasing as a doctrine to hold the imagination any longer in captivity to the authority of church or clergy.

But meantime other changes of a positive constructive character were in process, which were to bring their contribution of dignity and significance to the presbyterate when its former importance as a sacrificing priesthood should have faded away. The earlier functions of the Christian ministry, such as prophecy and teaching, were reappearing in the church at the close of the Middle Ages. The pre-Reformation age resembles the Apostolic age in this respect, that there came a revival of prophecy, when men who felt the evils of the existing situation were forced to look into the future and interpret the vision which was accorded to them. At no time during the Christian ages have such prophets been wholly wanting, but they multiplied in number and grew stronger in conviction and clearer in their vision as the Middle Ages drew toward their close. St. Bernard of Clairvaux, St. Brigitta, St. Catherine of Siena,— it is interesting to note how prominent were women in the prophetic ranks,— Hildegarde also, Joachim and his school, Roger Bacon and Dante, Wycliffe and Savonarola,— these were the leading spirits among many who felt called to prophesy, to foretell destruction to the existing order or else its purification yet so as by fire; till at last, in the words of Dr. Döllinger, "the prophetic expectation became the common consciousness, the saving anchor of faith, of all earnest religious spirits."

In the utterances of these prophets there was much which was not fulfilled, and much also which was fulfilled to the letter. They agreed in denouncing the low moral condition of the church and of the age, the inefficiency of the church in meeting the spiritual needs of the people. They reveal a deeper sense of sin and a deeper consciousness of

guilt, in which lay the preparation for the greater fulness of the coming age. It may well have been that the age was not so much worse than that which preceded it, that it was the increased sensitiveness to evil and wrong which made the time seem out of joint. It may have been that the church was doing its work in some respects as well as before, but greater, deeper needs and higher aspirations, which the church did not satisfy, made its deficiencies more apparent. But whatever may have been the actual case, the prophets began to dream of the coming of an Antichrist, whether as pope or emperor, in whom the evil of the age would be personally concentrated. In them there was a sense of failure and dread, as of impending danger, men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming upon the earth.

But while denunciation of existing evils, and portentous threats of disaster to follow, were staple elements in the prophetic vision, yet they do not constitute its most important features. It is the positive element of hope for a greater future that gave the prophets their power and made vital their appeal to their generation. In the teaching of Joachim and his school, it is the Eternal Gospel which is to have free scope and be glorified. The age which is coming in, is to be the age of the Holy Spirit. That had been the prophecy of Tertullian in the third century, when he looked to the Montanist prophets for hope and encouragement. But to Joachim that age of the Spirit was still in the future, though soon to be revealed. The ages that had gone before, he with Tertullian called the dispensations of the Father and the Son; or after Apostles, as the Petrine and Pauline periods. The new world was to be Johannine, when the Holy Ghost should be given in abundant measure.

Many of the prophets foretold the decline and fall of the papacy and of the Holy Roman Empire. Pope and Emperor were to be the mutual destroyers of each other's power. To some of them it was given to see the substitute, which already the age was providing, in the rise of the modern nationalities to freedom and independence.

Thus St. Hildegarde, of Bingen on the Rhine, portrayed the spontaneous uprising of the German nations rather than of the Latin peoples. The time was coming when princes would renounce the authority of the popes, when separate countries would rally around their own church rulers, and the power of the pope be limited to Rome. She also foretold the secularization of church property and a return to a condition where avarice and love of money would no longer be the besetting sin of the ecclesiastical orders. But while the prophets were right in depicting the greatness of the transformation that was at hand, they did not see how it was growing out of the existing order by eternal law, so that when the change should come it would seem like an easy and natural transition, which had been prepared of old, the will of God from the foundation of the world.[1]

The strength of pre-Reformation prophecy lay in its transcendental character. It spoke out from the instincts within the soul, from the depths of Christian feeling, whose inner motive was an awakened conscience. It trusted itself with entire abandon to the intuitive process, which sees and knows as by some mysterious endowment of the soul. In these respects it resembled what we perceive in the prophets of the post-Apostolic age. And herewith was connected the same evil and danger which then led to the suppression of the prophets as disturbing the order and unity of the church. But a corrective was at hand in the sixteenth century which the second century had not been able to supply. The force which was to purify prophecy, without diminishing its confidence in a certain divine insight into the truth of Christian revelation, lay in the coming of the teacher to take his place by the side of the prophet, bringing with him the stores of

[1] For a comprehensive picture of prophets and prophecy in the later Middle Ages, cf. Döllinger, *Fables and Prophecies of the Middle Ages*, Eng. Trans., to which the editor, the late Professor H. B. Smith, has added a valuable list of references; also Gebhart, *L'Italie Mystique, Histoire de la Renaissance Religieuse au Moyen Age;* Rousselot, *Histoire de l'Évangile Éternel;* Renan, *Nouvelles Études;* Preger, *Gesch. d. dtsch. Mystik.*, Vol. I., also the general *Church Histories* of Gieseler and Moeller.

human learning and the accuracy of a laborious and patient scholarship. The Revival of Learning, in the age before the Reformation, was preparing an ally for prophecy in the scholar, which should prevent the prophet from speaking at random with an undisciplined reason or intelligence, or from the point of view of a single individual without responsibility for the well-being of the community. Human learning, accurate criticism, the restoration of corrupted texts, a knowledge of man as revealed in history and of the working of the human soul under other conditions of life,— in all these so far as they recorded the slightest accents of the Holy Spirit, as well as in the New Testament, which was the Word of God to the church in every age, the teacher was to be proficient, and guard the prophet or the preacher from inward failure or from outward disaster.

Such an union of the prophet and teacher appeared in its complete form when Luther, with his powerful will, combined with absolute confidence in the truth as it was revealed to him in inward anguish and long-continued struggles, was accompanied by Melanchthon, the greatest scholar of his day, *Preceptor Germaniae*, whose learning and moderation constituted a check upon the bold, unqualified utterance of his friend and master. It was characteristic of Melanchthon, that he received no ordination and never entered the pulpit of the preacher, recalling in this respect the function of the teacher in the ancient church, when Justin or Origen or Jerome were content to do their work without any other ordination than that with which their calling endowed them. In this alliance between prophecy and learning, the church in Germany led the way. Nor has that land of scholars ever failed to furnish allies for the work of investigation, which prophecy needs for its stimulus, its purification, and its enlargement. Its scholars have dared to differ from Luther, as Melanchthon did, while yet holding him in honor and in reverence. They have made mistakes, and sometimes grievous ones, but have been ready to acknowledge them when convinced that they were wrong. By their mistakes, as well as by

positive contributions, they carry on the process of the search for truth, with no other reward than that which the search for truth can bring.

But in this respect Germany did not stand alone in the Reformation. The English Cranmer possessed the open mind of the scholar, a diligent student and a friend of the new learning, and bringing to the aid of the Church of England his ample knowledge, his wide sympathy, and his prophetic insight. In Calvin, also, who united in himself the two functions of prophecy and teaching, was illustrated in the Reformed Church the same combination which marked elsewhere the progress of the Reformation. Whether as a commentator or a theologian or a student of history, Calvin presented to his age the principle embodied in himself, that prophecy, in order to its success and permanence, must never neglect the alliance with human learning. It was because the Roman church dropped behind at this vital moment, that she lost her hold on the growing intelligence of Northern Europe.

III

The doctrine of the Atonement was invested with a deeper meaning and a new importance in the age of the Reformation. It had been developed in the monastery, the highest outcome of monastic aspiration; but as reproclaimed by Luther, by Calvin, and by English Reformers, substantially in the form which Anselm had given it, it became the basis of hope and deliverance for every man. It implied that men were emancipated from the fear of divine punishment, from the torture of an evil conscience laboring under the conviction of sin, because God Himself granted His pardon to every man in virtue of the atoning work of His Son. In the procurement of this grace of the divine love no agency intervened, but the individual soul must secure it, if it was to be secured at all, by direct approach to God through the faith in Christ, which could alone appropriate the heavenly gift. Men who had been set free from the terrors of the law and from

the fear of God by the love of God, had attained deliverance from all other evils which would be made manifest in God's good time. In this doctrine, which has sometimes seemed to a later age as if overdone by the Reformers, we have the keynote of the religious and social order which succeeded to the prestige of the papacy or the grandeur of the Holy Roman Empire. It stood for the restoration to the people of the authority with which God had invested them. Its result was to change the idea of the church, which was no longer conceived as existing in its sanctity apart from the people who composed it; but it was the congregation of faithful men, who by faith had appropriated the merits of the death of Christ.

It was in the method of apprehending the significance of ordination, that the organization of the Protestant churches revealed the influence of this principle.[1] The Gospel of Christ, as the Reformers conceived it, consisted essentially in the reproclamation of the message of deliverance from sin and its consequences by the atoning sacrifice of Christ, offered once for all. In response to the need for this proclamation, the preacher had appeared. But the qualification for the work of preaching the Gospel of truth could not be handed down in succession, or the gift imparted by any ministerial commission. It was one thing to empower a priesthood to offer the sacrifice of the Mass; it was another thing to fit the preacher for his task. In ecclesiastical language, the *matter* of ordination was now found in the call of the Spirit and His operation within the soul of the *ordinand;* the *form* lay in the imposition of hands, as the expressive symbol of recog-

[1] The words in the Latin Ordinal, *Accipe Spiritum*, etc., which have also been retained in the English Ordinal, have been sometimes interpreted to mean that the Holy Spirit is then imparted in order to qualify the candidate with the power of absolution, and hence importance has been attached to this formula, as if it were essential to the constituting a priesthood. But it has been shown that they were not introduced into the Latin Ordinal until the thirteenth century. For collections of early Latin Ordinals, cf. Morinus, *De Sacris Ecclesiae Ordinationibus*, and Martene, *De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus*. See also, for discussion of this point, Lefroy, *The Christian Ministry*, pp. 391 ff.

nition, before God and the people, of an antecedent divine act. Beneath this conception of ordination, as also beneath other rites or sacraments, was the tacit assumption that the action of the Holy Spirit must have done its initial work in order to justify the human procedure.[1]

It is at this point that the wide divergence is manifest between the new and the old order. There were variations and differences in the churches reorganized in the Reformation; in some cases the power of appointing a minister or pastor was believed to lie in the congregation, while in other cases greater significance attached to the action of the clergy, as specially empowered by the Spirit to act for the congregation. On this point the church in Germany differed from the church at Geneva. The later Independents or Congregationalists here took issue with the Presbyterians. But in all cases it was the Spirit which qualified, and the act of ordination which ratified. It had been the teaching of Thomas Aquinas, who in this respect represented the inmost purpose of

[1] Dorner, *His. Prot. Theol.*, I., p. 274; Hagenbach, *His. of Doc.*, III., § 256; for summary of Luther's teaching on ordination: Gieseler, *Ec. His.*, Vol. IV., § 46; Kurtz, *Ch. His.*, Vol. II., § 142; Richter, *Geschichte der evangelischen Kirchenverfassung in Deutschland*, and *Lehrbuch des katholischen und evangelischen Kirchenrechts;* Rietschel, *Luther und die Ordination;* Stahl, *Die Kirchenverfassung nach Lehre und Recht der Protestanten.* "Die Ordination ist Aufnahme in den 'geistlichen Stand.' Gewiss giebt es einen 'geistlichen Stand' auch in der evangelischen Kirche. Auch für die evangelische Kirche ist es zweifellos, dass die Geistesgaben (Charismen) verschieden sind. Alle Christen sind 'Geistliche'; im engeren Sinn sind 'Geistliche' die vor Anderen durch Geistesgaben Ausgezeichneten. Im kirchlichen Sinn sind 'Geistliche' (dem 'geistlichen Stande' angehörig) die Ordinierten, d. h. diejenigen, deren sonderliche Geistesgabe kirchlich anerkannt ist. Nur diese sind im stande, in der Kirche als Geistliche aufzutreten. Nur diese können daher in der Kirche das öffentliche Predigtamt verwalten. Allen anderen fehlt der consensus, die voluntas ecclesiae. Die Ordination ist die Bezeugung der göttlichen (durch das Charisma gegebenen) Berufung zum Lehramt (der Wahl der Urzeit entsprechend) mit nachfolgender Handauflegung" (Sohm, *Kirchenrecht*, I. 497). Calvin distinguished between the divine call to the ministry and the human call, as by the public order of the church, which is ordination. Of the first call, he remarks that "those whom the Lord has destined for this great office he previously provides with the armor which is requisite for the discharge of it, that they may not come empty and unprepared" (*Instit.*, B. IV., c. 3, § 11).

the Latin church from the time of Cyprian, that in the sacrament of orders, the virtue and the excellency, that is, the spiritual power, came through the ministrant himself; while in the other sacraments the gift was derived from God, not from the ministrant.[1] The Latin church was here involved in the anomaly of holding that ordination, which was the sacrament by which the church existed and was maintained, owed its power and validity to a human agency, but this same human agency qualified for a priesthood which could mediate the divine power as in the sacrament of baptism or of the altar. The reformed churches escaped from this strange anomaly by referring the initial act which maintains the church and the ministry to the continuous direct agency of the Holy Spirit.

The Lutheran and Genevan forms of church government, while claiming a divine sanction, reflect also the monastic experience and practice; whether in the democratic scheme proposed for the church in Hesse, by Lambert, a Franciscan monk, which resembles the earlier Benedictine order in making each local church independent or sufficient in itself; or in the plan of government by presbyterial consistories advocated by Calvin, which reflects the later organization of great monastic orders with many houses affiliated under a common constitution. Again, the influence of the monastery is seen in the restoration to the presbyter of the episcopal dignity of a defender of the faith. In the Roman ordinal for making a presbyter, the candidate underwent no examination before

[1] Cf. Thomas, *Summa*, p. iii; *Suppl.* Q. 34, Art. 5: "Quia hoc quod confertur in aliis sacramentis, derivatur tantum a deo, non a ministro, qui sacramentum dispensat, sed illud quod in hoc sacramento traditur, scil. spiritualis potestas, derivatur etiam ab eo qui sacramentum dat, sicut potestas imperfecta a perfecta. Et ideo efficacia aliorum sacramentorum principaliter consistit in materia, quae virtutem divinam et significat et continet, ex sanctificatione per ministrum adhibita. Sed efficacia huius sacramenti principaliter residet penes eum, qui sacramentum dispensat, materia autem adhibetur magis ad demonstrandam potestatem, quae traditur particulariter ab habente eam complete, quam ad potestatem causandam, quod patet ex hoc, quod materia competit usui potestatis." Cf. also Harnack, *Dogmengesch.*, III., pp. 520 ff.

the people as to qualifications for his office, no inquiry was made into his religious experience or theological belief; those who presented him certified to his fitness, and he himself, after having been empowered to offer the sacrifice of the Mass, took but one vow,— that of obedience to his bishop. But in the rite of consecrating a bishop, the examination was elaborate and minute, taking up the creeds as a whole as well as in their separate articles. The presbyter was here regarded as receiving these truths by assent to authority, while in the case of the bishop, as the defender of the faith, there was required a more interior knowledge and as it were an inward persuasion. Hence the presbyters took no vow to defend the faith, while in the bishop's consecration this vow is prominent and emphatic. It is assumed also that the bishop is acquainted with the Scripture, and will employ it for maintaining the faith. But in the Protestant churches it became a primary feature in the ordination of a presbyter, that he should be carefully examined on the contents of Christian doctrine before his certification to the people as competent for the work of the ministry.

How greatly the situation had changed in the sixteenth century from what it had been in the second century is shown in this, that the prerogative of the bishops to be the guardians of a deposit of faith received by tradition from the Apostles had lost its hold on the Christian mind. Irenæus had urged the claim, and so had Tertullian, and both had applied the principle to the church at Rome, in which the faith had been preserved in its purity. But to have urged that argument in the age of the Reformation would have seemed to the Reformers like mockery. The faith as they held it had been covered up with additions, obscured and neutralized not only by the see of Rome, but by the bishops in union with Rome. In the consecration of the bishop in the Latin church, while the first interrogation called for his vow to teach the people, both by word and example, what he found in Holy Scripture, the next interrogation called for his assent to the traditions of the orthodox Fathers, and to the decretals and constitutions

of the holy and Apostolic see of Rome. But it was now the ruling idea of any reform, that the faith and doctrine of Christ must be sought alone in the New Testament, and to this end the decretals and constitutions of Rome must be rejected. And again, among the traditions of the church but little had been handed down in regard to what it was so important to know,—the formation of the books of Scripture, the time when, or the authors by whom, they had been written. And not only so, but the Latin church had preserved the Gospel only at second hand in the translation of the Latin Vulgate, nor was it eager to assist in the task of restoring the original Greek text in which the words of life had originally been given.

But further, the Reformers were placing the axe at the root of the tree from which had grown the Mediæval episcopate, with its territorial sovereignty and power, when they proclaimed the doctrine of justification by faith. It was the bishop Cyprian who had first announced the principle, in his treatise on alms-giving, that salvation was aided and pardon more easily secured by gifts to the church. That principle had become the ruling idea of the church in the Middle Ages, boldly proclaimed without resistance or scruple. It had enriched the bishops with lands and patrimonial estates as the foundations of their wealth and social dignity. The States of the Church in Italy had been accumulated in similar fashion. The monasteries had sought to achieve poverty as an ideal, but they had failed, because the working of this principle inevitably brought to them the wealth which they shunned. Successive generations of devout men, aiming at the regeneration of the monastic life by a more rigid enforcement of the vow of poverty, had not succeeded, because they could not banish the test of piety which was everywhere accepted, — that to give to the church was to lay up treasure in heaven. St. Francis of Assisi was the first to illustrate a higher principle, though he failed to secure its adoption in the order which he left behind him. Not to lay up treasure in heaven, but to do good on earth for its own sake, and to make acts of charity out of pure

love for human souls, without the motive of securing one's own salvation, was his aim; and so exceptional was his career, in that alms-giving, alms-seeking age, that his followers had looked upon him as a second Christ. Wycliffe also recurs to the mind in this connection as struggling against the evils which the wealth of the church was creating. He sanctioned the effort to restore this wealth again to the state, where it properly belonged. It was no robbery of God in his opinion, when the money or land which had been given to the church in the name of God was appropriated by the state; for Christ had invested the state alone with dominion to rule, and had entrusted to the church the function of ministry or service.

All the attempts to overcome this principle and motive, which claimed its warrant in the sacred text, that those who had houses or lands and sold them and brought the proceeds and laid them at the Apostles' feet, these diverse and long-continued efforts to overcome a conception of religion which tended toward its deterioration, may have been contributing silently to that end. But it was in the doctrine of justification by faith, as Luther proclaimed it, that the counter motive was found, whose acceptance at once placed the church upon another basis. Just as the evils and corruption which permeated the church, which were making its hierarchy a scandal and offence in the later Middle Ages, had sprung from the principle that the giving of money contributed to salvation; so the doctrine of Luther, which he drew from St. Paul, tended wherever it was received at least to check this abuse. As a doctrine it had other and positive aspects, not alluded to here. But it had the negative effect of discrediting the theory and practice of indulgences, as it also stopped the drain on secular property for the enrichment of the church. Of Luther and of Zwingli and of Calvin, it may be said that they made no money by their profession, and died alike in poverty. It was a remark about Calvin, attributed to one of the popes, that nothing could be done with such a man, because he did not care for money.

IV

In two of the countries of Europe where the Reformation prevailed, the episcopate was retained,—England and Sweden; in all the other countries, Switzerland, Germany, the Netherlands, Denmark, and Scotland, it was rejected. It becomes necessary then to inquire why it should have been preserved in some countries and abandoned in others, seeing that the principles of the Reformation prevailed in all alike, in England and in Sweden no less than in Switzerland or Germany.

It has sometimes been maintained that there were peculiar difficulties in the Swiss and German situation which made it impossible to retain the episcopate, even if its retention had been desired. On this ground English writers, such as Hooker and Lord Bacon, explained or apologized for the organization of the Continental churches. In this view there is truth, but not to the extent that the German Reformers could not have secured the ordination of their ministers by bishops if it had been really desired or thought essential. Several of the bishops in Germany gave in their adherence to the Reformation, three at least,—the number required by the Council of Nicæa for making a bishop,—and these were allowed to hold their office till their death. But they were not called upon to exercise their prerogative of ordination, nor do they appear to have insisted on its necessity to a valid ministry. Melanchthon, and to a certain extent Luther, had no objection to the episcopate, as exercising a function of supervision over the churches, if it could have been based upon human right, *jure humano*, and not *jure divino*. But Melanchthon went further, and would not have objected to the papacy, if the office could have been regarded as one created by the suffrages of Christian people.[1] Nor did Calvin have any dislike for the office of bishop as such. On the contrary, he rather approved on the whole of the organization of the church in the second and third cen-

[1] Cf. Hagenbach, *His. of the Reformation*, II., p. 234; and Gieseler, *Ec. His.*, IV., § 46.

turies, when the bishop was the pastor of the local church, with presbyters and deacons for his assistants, remarking upon the system, that those who introduced it did not stray far from the divine enactments of Scripture.[1] But he did not think the system was drawn from the New Testament or could claim its sanction. The situation at Geneva was peculiar. For many years its magistrates and citizens had been engaged in a struggle for liberty, in which they were resisting the power of the prince bishop, to whom the city belonged. When they had been successful in this effort, it was hardly conceivable that they should have regarded it as important to reintroduce episcopal authority by setting up another bishop. The political situation was bad enough as it was, but this might have made it worse and put again in jeopardy the liberty of the city.

It was assumed by the Continental Reformers that episcopacy, as it then existed, had no warrant from Scripture or from Apostolic usage. That alone would have determined the question. The doctrine of Jerome had done its work, that in the beginning of Christ's religion there had been no distinction between the bishop and the presbyter. The teaching of Jerome acted as a solvent of the old ecclesiastical order, carrying as it did not only the statement of the supposed fact, but also an argument, that in the nature of the case there was no inherent superiority of the bishops over the presbyters. It had been a matter of ecclesiastical arrangement, which as it had once been done could be undone, should circumstances demand it. It seemed to the Reformers, to Luther, to Zwingli, and Calvin, that the time for a change and a reversion to the earlier order had now come. But in England, also, the Reformers were familiar with Jerome's principles, and, as in the case of Cranmer, were influenced by them, and yet not to the extent of rejecting the episcopate. The case of the Old Catholic church, as it is called, in our own day, which on separating from Rome at once took steps to provide for an episcopal succession, or of the Jansenist

[1] *Instit.*, B. IV., c. 4, § 1.

church in Holland, which attached a like importance to the office and became the source from which the Old Catholic movement received consecration for its bishops, may serve to indicate that the difficulties in the way in Germany or in Switzerland were not insuperable, had it been thought essential to preserve the office of the episcopate as a higher order than the presbyterate. The question, therefore, why in some countries the episcopate was retained, and in others rejected, calls for a further examination of the actual situation.

The sixteenth century exhibits as its most deep and characteristic principle an inward freedom and voluntariness, which affected the life of the nations no less than the spirit of the churches. For a moment, the world seemed to have been left free to make its choice, when all the hidden influences which had been at work for ages could manifest their fruit, the outcome for which, consciously or indirectly, they had been laboring. It was the great day of manifestation, when the long and weary process of development had reached its limits, when the nations, as well as interior movements within the church, were to come bringing their honor with them, their contribution to the fortunes of humanity. It was a day of national as well as of ecclesiastical reform, which had been made possible by the decline of the papacy. That revolution by which the papacy was overthrown, included in its range all other changes, an event so momentous that it affected alike the fortunes of the episcopate in the national churches, no less than those of the presbyterate in the monastery. It marks the extent of the change in the attitude of the papacy, that it was forced to submit the question of its own continued existence, or its retention in some modified form, to the will of the princes. It was to become from henceforth a voluntary institution, which the nations were at liberty to receive or reject at their pleasure, and, as it seemed at the moment, on their own terms. Its subsidence as a world-power had left standing, and as it were confronting each other, these two distinct and divergent types or ideals of the Christian church, the

secular or national represented by the episcopate, and the religious or individual represented by the presbyterate.

In Germany and Switzerland the Reformation was begun by presbyters, relying on their divine right, independent of pope or bishop, but responsible alone to God. The bishops nowhere, with the possible exception of England, appear as leaders in the movement for ecclesiastical readjustment. Their position was a difficult one, for they were bound by the oath taken at their consecration to maintain "the traditions of the orthodox fathers and to hold in reverence, to teach, and to obey the sacred decretals of the Apostolic see, and to exhibit their faith in and their subordination and obedience to the blessed Apostle Peter, to whom God had given the power of binding and loosing, and to his vicar the Lord Pope, and his successors."[1] The presbyters, when they left the monasteries, as Luther had done, were set free from their oath by the light of a conviction which rendered such an oath null and nugatory before God. The presbyterate, which was to arise spontaneously under Calvin, was limited by no oath to any allegiance. But the episcopate was bound not only to the papacy, but also to the state. If it was to escape, as a body, or to relax the rigidity of its vow, it must be by the agency of the secular authority, by the influence of the elevating principle of national unity and independence.

When the countries of Europe were called upon to choose in the great alternative, Italy and Spain, Austria and France, decided to abide by the old ecclesiastical order, reducing, however, the papacy to a primacy so far as the national interests were concerned. But even in

[1] *Interrogatio*

Vis traditiones Orthodoxorum Patrum, ac Decretales sanctae et Apostolicae sedis Constitutiones veneranter suscipere, docere, ac servare? Volo.

Interrogatio

Vis beato Petro Apostolo, cui a Deo data est potestas ligandi, ac solvendi; ejusque Vicario Domino nostro, Domino N. Papae N. suisque successoribus, Romanis Pontificibus; fidem, subjectionem, et obedientiam, secundum canonicam auctoritatem, per omnia exhibere? Volo.

these countries, the revolution showed its influence in raising anew for prolonged and painful discussion the question whether the bishops held by an immediate divine right or by the mediate grace of the pope. With the exception of Italy, the tendency of the bishops in these countries was to reclaim their lost prerogatives and insist on the divine right of episcopacy; in this demand they were aided and abetted by their respective sovereigns. The question came up for discussion at the Council of Trent, when through the agency of the papal legates it was finally waived, so that no decision was formally decreed. But it is not with these countries which decided to adhere to the Latin obedience that we are chiefly concerned, except so far as they illustrate the voluntary principle that the episcopate was retained wherever the king and bishops were united in a common national purpose.

Among the northern nations who rejected the papal authority, this same conjunction of monarchy and episcopacy is to be seen, those countries alone retaining the episcopate in which the Reformation was led by the king, with the acquiescence, if not the cordial support, of the bishops. Such was the case in England, where the king moved first with the co-operation of the laity, as in Parliament, and where the bishops supported the king, acknowledging the changed order by which the king took the place of the pope, holding their allegiance to their sovereign as higher than their allegiance to the pope. In one other country alone was there a similar attitude: in Sweden the king was allowed to have his will in the reconstruction, and there also, though not with cheerful acquiescence, the bishops submitted, and the order of the episcopate was allowed to remain. In Scotland, there was at first an alliance between the king and the bishops in the interest of the papal allegiance. But the kingship in Scotland had never been fortunate in its history; and when the monarchy proved a failure after the death of James V., or was not able to overcome the incidents in its career which had ministered to its weakness, the nobility took the lead, and the episcopate was rejected. The case of

the Netherlands is peculiar, where a strong nationality was ultimately developed. Here there were great leaders supported by the popular will, but kingship did not exist. When Philip II. endeavored to bind the country more closely to his authority by the multiplication of bishops, there was begotten a new motive of resistance to his purpose; and when the Netherlands attained their freedom, the episcopate had disappeared. In Denmark, the bishops resisted the king's desire to change the ecclesiastical status, and here the episcopate was lost, or subsided into a merely titular position, retaining the name, but not the functions, of their order. Switzerland had given birth to two Reformers, Zwingli and Calvin, both of whom built upon the divine right of the presbyterate, both of whom held the monastic ideal of the church, as the congregation of those whom God should elect. But in the Swiss Confederacy, which received the call to nationality earlier than the surrounding states, there was no king who stood as the focus and centralization of the national consciousness, and hence there was no national support for the episcopate upon which it could rely when its prerogatives were assaulted.

As to Germany, she lagged behind the other nations in her advance to nationality. It had been her misfortune, in some respects, that during the Middle Ages she had been so closely united to Italy by the theory of the Holy Roman Empire. Her emperors should have been her kings, by the consolidation of whose power the state would have realized its unity. But as in Italy the pope had been sufficiently powerful to keep the state divided, so in Germany his influence, or the influence of a theory, had kept the emperors weak, and a stable hereditary monarchy had not been attained. The emperors had aimed to get control of Italy in harmony with the theory which made them her kings, and thus their attention was diverted from their proper work, till Germany was allowed to divide into numerous independent states, and the power of its sovereign was reduced to emptiness. The episcopate in Germany had also a peculiar history. It had been set free

from the control of the metropolitans under the Carolingian rulers, only to attain still greater freedom and independence when the Carolingian monarchy gave way to the feudal régime. The great archbishops and other bishops of Germany were secular lords, having the rights of absolute authority within their domains, with powers of administering justice, regulating coinage, seeking the aggrandizement of their wealth and power by war upon their neighbors, or, when commerce and trade increased in their cities, robbing the merchants and burgesses by unjust taxation. Where episcopal sees constituted independent principalities, and were sufficiently strong to resist invasion, they survived; but within the territories of princes who accepted the Reformation, their secular possessions were appropriated by the prince, and the bishops disappeared. Their allegiance to the emperor might have preserved their order even in these states, but the emperor had only a nominal authority and could not enforce his will.

This close relationship of dependence between the episcopate and the royal authority, which becomes so apparent in the age of the Reformation, illustrates more clearly the nature and work of the episcopate in the Middle Ages. To a large extent the bishops had been doing the work of the state, at a time when the state was still in its infancy, unable to fulfil its true functions. They performed the duties which afterwards were to be devolved upon the secular judge or magistrate. Their connection with secular affairs had reacted upon their religious duties. They were binding together the secular and the sacred in an organic relationship, preparing the nation, when it should come of age, to recognize the sacredness of its calling, illustrating and enforcing the important truth, that the spiritual life was not to be detached from the duties which bind men to their neighborhood or country, but is rather a motive which consecrates all the relations of life. We may still trace their work in the episcopal cities in which they ruled, in the vast cathedrals which their religious zeal or ambition suggested and their enormous wealth enabled them to realize. In schools and charitable insti-

tutions, in university foundations, we may read what the bishops were when at their best. But it was one of the nobler aspects of their office to represent to the monarch and to the common people an idea of religion which was not overstrained, or whose aspirations were not so high and unearthly as to discourage or intimidate. They sailed lower in their flight than their monastic rivals, and if they fell, they did not fall so low. If in some countries they disappeared, they bequeathed the result of their labors to be incorporated into the secular domain. The state appropriated their tasks when it reached its majority, but the spirit in which it had been done still survived and was represented in other agencies. It is easy to misrepresent them, and, by taking individual instances as representing their order, to underrate the importance of their contribution to religion, as well as to Christian civilization. But however unworthy individual bishops may have been, or inadequate their appreciation of their duties, we are always nearer the truth, when we take the higher estimate than the lower, that which redounds to their credit rather than that which signals their failure. It is true of kings and of princes, of monks and abbots, of popes, also, and of bishops, that when weakness strikes them which they cannot overcome, it is a sign that their work has been done, or that other forms of administration are needed in order to suit the needs of an advancing world. If the bishops became inefficient or seemed unnecessary, it was in part because the state was beginning to assume their secular functions. In some cases, and chiefly in England, they were enabled to make the transition to a different conception of their order, by the aid of the state; in others they failed to do so, and their office was abolished. In some cases, as in Germany and Switzerland, Scotland, the Netherlands, and Denmark, the episcopate not only appeared as unnecessary, but as incompatible with the spirit of the Reformed churches. But in England the episcopate was transformed by its emancipation from the control of the papacy, as well as by other adjustments, and, thus set free, devoted its ener-

gies anew to the support and defence of the crown in the most difficult period of its history. The result in England was not only a stable monarchy, a nationality which has outstripped others in the race, but a stable ecclesiastical institution also in the established Church, which has never failed to reflect and to promote the interests of the state, as well as the religious life of the people.[1]

It may throw some further light upon the question why the episcopate was retained in certain countries and rejected in others, if we look at the situation in Western Europe at the moment of its conversion to Christianity. It is not without significance to find that in those countries which had been Christianized before the monasteries arose, such as Italy, France, and Spain, the Reformation of the sixteenth century was not demanded; they adhered to the Latin church and to the episcopate which had been a constituent element in its original constitution. But wherever the monks had travelled, especially those from the Irish-Scotch monasteries, with their peculiar apprehension of the religion of Christ, there an influence had been exerted which was never entirely lost. In this way subtle forms of spiritual influence may have entered into the life of the people, to reappear again when all memory of their origin had long been lost. Scotland had from the first a monastic form of Christianity, in which bishops were not prominent, and when the Reformation came, it accepted the monastic ideal of the church. The influence of the monks in Switzerland and Germany had laid the foundation of the church and had been perpetuated in powerful monastic foundations as well as by a monastic episcopate. So it was also in the Netherlands, converted by

[1] The question of the relation of church and state underlies the present ecclesiastical situation, and to one who goes beneath the surface it appears as fraught with living issues and involving the solution of existing difficulties. The opinion of Rothe and Dr. Arnold, that the state is the final form which Christianity will assume, has been more recently asserted by Seeley in *Natural Religion*, c. iv.: "Under the modern state there lurks an undeveloped church; . . . Every community is in one aspect a church, as in another it is a state" (p. 189).

monastic preachers, where bishops had always been few in number.

England, also, it is true, had been converted by the agency of the monastery, after the country, which had once been Christian, had lapsed into heathenism in consequence of the Anglo-Saxon conquest. And again at a later time, when Northern England had fallen away from the church, it had been reconverted by the monks who came from Scotland. But it is a peculiarity of English history that its kings were not only consulted as to the introduction of Christianity, but their approval, their co-operation, and even their initiative action appear as an element in the process of England's conversion. This was true of England as it was not of Germany, where the royal power hardly existed when the work of its conversion began. In England the germs of nationality through kingship had taken earlier and deeper root than in other purely Teutonic countries. That in England also monasticism never became as influential, despite its early opportunities, as in other countries, may be inferred from the circumstance that England never gave birth to any great monastic order, as well as from the ease with which the monasteries were swept away in the sixteenth century.[1] Her monastic houses were importations from abroad. Some of her chief monastic ornaments, such as Alcuin or Occam, migrated to other homes. Twice, indeed, in English history, great monks appear as closely connected with the throne,—Dunstan († 988), who was a statesman and for a time seems to have controlled the state, and then Anselm († 1109), whose ultramontane attitude prepared the way for England's subjection to the papacy. But in the long survey, it is England's kings and their policy which forms the leading feature of English history, while monasticism, which at heart remained indifferent to nationality, as it had been in its origin, does not attain the power or promi-

[1] For a sketch of English monasticism, see Gairdner, *Early Chroniclers of Europe; England.* Cf. also Gasquet, *Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries*, and Dixon, *History of the Church of England*, Vol. I.; both of whom write in the interest of the monasteries.

nence which its early introduction might seem to have deserved.[1]

It is in harmony, then, with the spirit of English traditions, that her greatest Reformer, in some respects the greatest man whom she has produced, should have issued forth from the secular church rather than from the monastery. The influence of Wycliffe may not be directly traced in the English Reformation, while at the same time the leading principle of his conception of reform was embodied in the legislation of the sixteenth century. He had taught more clearly and forcibly than any one who preceded or followed him the divine authority of the secular power. He had been the defender of the prerogatives of Parliament in its conflict with the pope. His alliance with the state was most intimate and real, because it sprang from the deep religious conviction that the king was clothed with the dominion of Christ. It was his conviction that one source of the evil which afflicted the church sprang from the temptations of the wealth which was possessed by bishops and clergy and by the monasteries. He taught that the church should be poor in imitation of its Master. He did not lay down, as Luther did, a principle which overcame the difficulty at its source, but he believed that the state, acting as Christ's representative, had the divine right to take from the church its property, whenever it was misused. Since the state possessed the *dominium* of Christ, while the *ministerium* was the function of the

[1] "From the earliest period in England," says Makower, "church and state remained in intimate union. It is true, occasions arose when the archbishop of Canterbury openly opposed the king. Such dissensions, however, were of a personal and transient character; there were no real and lasting controversies as to the relation of state and church. As a rule, the king, with the assistance of the archbishop of Canterbury, directed alike the secular and the ecclesiastical administration of England" (*Constit. His. of the Ch. of Eng.*, p. 8).

The history of Scandinavia furnishes an analogous case with England, since there also the king invited the missionary monks into the country and labored with them for its Christianization. Here, too, as in Sweden, the king and the bishops together accepted the Reformation, and the episcopate was retained. But Scandinavia was retarded in its advance toward nationality by the loss of so large and energetic a part of its population in the Norman invasion.

church, preaching and the cure of souls appeared to him as the true work of the Christian ministry, from which it had been withdrawn by the extraneous duties it had assumed, the discharge of which belonged rather to the state than to the church. From this point of view the distinction between bishop and presbyter lost its importance to his mind. Like the later Reformers on the Continent, he was influenced by Jerome's principle of the parity of bishops and presbyters in the age of the beginnings of the church. The English Church retained the episcopate at the Reformation, but in other respects it followed the purpose of Wycliffe. He had made bitter war in his later years against the endowed monastic orders; and as he met with their resistance, as well as that of the mendicant orders, he carried his opposition still further, and condemned the principle of mendicancy as false to the teaching of Christ. His opposition to monasticism was grounded also on its indifference or hostility to the royal power, or its alliance with the papacy, whose aim was to lower the royal dignity by robbing it of its divine right. It is a significant fact that the second step in the English Reformation, after the papacy had been rejected, was the abolition of the monasteries, and the appropriation of their property by the state. In this we may recognize the influence of Wycliffe's teaching, as well as the natural result of England's peculiar history as a nation.

The interest which attaches to Wycliffe has grown deeper in recent years, as his writings have been more clearly studied, and especially his unpublished manuscripts. A sense of the greatness of his personality has increased, of his representative character as a comprehensive mind in whom his age found its most ample reflection. He went deeper also than his contemporaries could follow; indeed, his principles seem to ally him with the modern socialistic conception of reform. He appears at times to be one-sided and extreme in his passionate opposition to great evils imbedded in corporate ecclesiastical institutions. He was claimed by the later Puritans as their forerunner and representative, because of his principle of

the parity of the ministry, and for other reasons, but in reality he belonged to another cause, the sacredness of the state and its organic relation to the church — that doctrine which has been the mainspring of what is highest and most attractive in English history, which was reaffirmed with deeper emphasis at the Reformation, and which still survives in the English Church, as one source of its strength, as that which differentiates it to some extent in principle from the other Protestant churches.[1]

V

The English Reformation differed from the contemporary reforms on the Continent, in that it was a movement led by king and Parliament, with the co-operation of the episcopate. Among the bishops there was practical unanimity of conviction and action, when after the long preparation of centuries a king arose who, as the representative of the national will, stood ready to sever the connection between the English nation and the bishop of Rome. With one exception, the bishops supported the king and rejected as no longer binding the ordination vow, which the Englishman Boniface had been the first to take, of obedience and subjection to the papacy. In view of the many similar antecedents and precedents in English history, it seems impossible to conceive that they should have taken any other course. The national purpose then demanded the rejection of papal authority, and with that demand the episcopate, which had always been the support and the bearer of the national idea, was in close and natural sympathy.

The English Reformation differs further from the movements led by Luther and Calvin in that to a bishop and

[1] Among the many histories of the Church of England, one of the latest and best is Perry, *His. of the Ch. of Eng.*, 3 vols., 1862. Among others may be mentioned the works of Burnet, Strype, Heylin, Fuller, Maitland, Hook, Massingberd, Short, Carwithen, Southey, Soames, Blunt, Wakeman, and Hunt, *His. of Religious Thought in England.* For the pre-Reformation history, Bede, Ussher, Stillingfleet, Soames, and Collier. See also Art. *Church of England* by Perry in *Enc. Brit.*, VIII., pp. 370 ff.

not a presbyter was assigned the task of revising the standards and of reforming doctrine, discipline, and worship. The large-minded and scholarly Cranmer, an adherent of the new learning and in sympathy with the spirit of the age, reflected in himself the prevailing ideas of his time, accepting the doctrine of justification by faith, the doctrine of election also, and rejecting the ideas of transubstantiation and priesthood. In these respects, the English Reformation was conducted on lines similar to those followed in Germany and Switzerland. But yet there was a divergence even here, since in all that was done, whether in rejecting the old or accepting the new, the conception of a national church was a distinct motive, the welfare of the nation was a spiritual principle, and the appeal was to national authority as the divine warrant by whose sanction reforms were made.

But it is in the treatment of the monasteries that the peculiar features of the English Reformation most distinctly appear. The monks not only did not share in the great movement, but for the most part were in opposition to the policy of the king. The secular church had developed in England to such an extent, and with such deep hold upon the people, that when the king stood ready to abolish, at one stroke as it were, that whole side of Mediæval Christianity, it was accomplished without difficulty, without protest or resistance. In Germany or in the Netherlands and Switzerland there was a more complete fusion of the 'religious' and the 'secular'; the monastery united with the secular clergy in one common aim and result, the monastic spirit, however, possessing the ascendency. But in England the monastic clergy were not consulted; place was made for them in the secular church as it might be found convenient; they appear as conquered subjects, resigned to a will which for a time they were powerless to dispute. Whether any other adjustment was possible, need not be here discussed. The Reformers of the English Church had gone a long way toward reconciling the monastic spirit with the secular ecclesiastical order, when they made the worship which had

been developed in the monastery the basis of the revised ritual, giving henceforth in all the parishes the foremost place to the Morning and Evening Prayer, and thus recognizing the appeal of monastic worship to the intelligence of the individual worshipper. Unless some such change had been accepted, the peaceable reform of the church could not have been accomplished. In this way the Church of England swung into line with the leading tendencies of the age, recognizing the spirit and the result of monastic Christianity, the priesthood of all Christians, as manifested in one common sacrifice of prayer and praise.

But still the violent suppression of the monasteries remained as bearing witness to the employment of force in effecting the reform. Admirable as was the reform in itself, there remained an element in the kingdom which had not been consulted in its adoption. When the state proceeded, as in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, to use the bishops as the agents of the crown in enforcing uniformity of worship, there came an outbreak of resistance, which showed that the monastic spirit still survived. While Germany was convulsed with theological controversies, there was maturing in England the preparation for a great schism,— the severest ordeal through which England had ever been called to pass, the motive of which was no other than the ancient hostility of the monastic presbyterate against the secular episcopate. It was not that the Puritans objected so much, after all, to the order of the Book of Common Prayer, although they did object; what they most deeply resented was its enforcement by the bishops. There was no longer any outlet for their dissatisfaction, as in the Middle Ages there had been, when the papacy mediated between bishop and presbyter. The issue which Jerome had raised about the original equality of bishop and presbyter now came up for discussion and ventilation as never before in the history of the church. Neither side could convince the other, and neither would make concessions, nor could a compromise be reached until both parties had tested their strength in a prolonged and bitter struggle for the supremacy.

When James I. espoused the cause of the bishops, as in his famous remark, "No bishop, no king," what had been originally a religious movement was passing into political warfare, in which the parties contested for the possession of the state. In that conflict, the issues and the results were vital. The emigration to New England began, with the avowed purpose of setting up "a church without a bishop, and a state without a king." The bishops clung more closely to the king, in proportion as the issue seemed to involve the abolition of the monarchy altogether. They paid dearly for their adhésion to the sovereign, but it was in keeping with their traditions since English history began, that they should support the throne in its emergencies. It was not with them a question of whether the king was right or wrong; they stood by his side as the bearer of a sacred principle,— the divine life of the state, which was struggling in mortal throes. The first result of the struggle was the disestablishment and overthrow of the church, which for a generation lay prostrate at the feet of victorious Puritanism. Then came a change, when the king was brought back, and the church was restored. But the issue was not over until the Revolution in 1688, which brought the final compromise,— religious toleration for individuals and for churches who rejected the authority of the episcopate. Since then the English Nonconforming churches have taken the place of the ancient monasteries, building upon the same principles outlets of activity and refuge in which individualism may assert itself, when it can find no other vent. When a man is emerging into the knowledge of himself, and wishes to exercise the fundamental prerogative of manhood in making a choice, it is in the things of religion that he first feels the obstacles in his way. There are those who prefer to be born into a church, and are grateful for the privileges which the absence of choice in the matter has brought them. There are those, on the other hand, who find that the essence of religion involves one supreme determination of the will. To such in England, nonconformity still offers the possibilities which in the Mediæval church created a rich

variety of monastic orders. It is the tendency of the Church of England to minister to individual freedom on the basis of the solidarity of the state; the tendency of the Nonconformist churches is to create groups of solidarities on the basis of individual freedom and agreement in religious opinion.

The conflict between the episcopate and the presbyterate, which has now been traced in brief outline from its origin, must not be dismissed without a word as to certain larger bearings which it involves. It has not been a conflict confined to the Christian church. When we turn to Jewish history, the same issue may be detected in the long struggle from the time of the rise of Jewish monarchy till its decline. The question then took the shape of a rivalry between the prophet and the king. In the Jewish theocracy, where church and state were one, the king had the function of ecclesiastical oversight, while the prophet was to declare the Word of God to all alike, without distinction of rank. Should prophetism be placed above royalty, or royalty above prophetism, or were they co-ordinate powers which, when they came in conflict, must settle their differences as best they could under the universal solvent — the well-being of the nation? In the Northern kingdom, prophetism had gained the advantage over the kings. The Northern state was founded by the advice of prophets, and dynasties were displaced at their pleasure, with the result that monarchy was weakened and the state came to a premature end. In the Southern kingdom a different *modus vivendi* was reached, where the prophet appears more as a co-ordinate authority subject to the king, and yet free to proclaim his conviction. In the Southern kingdom there were conflicts also, but occasional glimpses are given of a happier adjustment. David appears no less a king, when he accepts the word of the prophet which was condemnation of his evil-doing; and the prophet, while he approaches the king in freedom, reverences also an authority which is divine and co-ordinate with his own. So it was with Hezekiah and

Isaiah. But when the kingdom of Judah began to decline kings appeared who aimed to suppress the freedom of the prophet in uttering his entire message from God. And it is not only in Judah, but in every history of every state, that the same eternal issue is forever arising, and upon its solution depend the fortunes of the nation.

Such is the essence of the struggle in the Christian church from its foundation. There is, on the one hand, the function of preaching, which demands freedom of utterance. The teacher must speak with all boldness the lesson of the hour, adjusting the form of the proclamations of the message from God in accordance with human learning and the changes which time and progress demand. On the other hand, there is the function of administration of ecclesiastical affairs, in the interest of growth and of order, of unity and peace. Which shall be supreme over the other, when their interests conflict? Or is their true relation one of co-ordinate authority? In the Catholic church, from the time of Cyprian and by his agency, the effort was made to place the function of administration above preaching or prophecy. In the Eastern church, the state appears as exercising important episcopal functions, and the church with bishops and presbyters is in such close sympathy with the state that the issue rarely rises to the surface. In Western Europe, with the rise of monasticism and the growing consciousness of the church as distinct from the state, the question of bishop and presbyter became a vital principle. The papacy mediated between them, and for a long period with such success that the secular episcopate and the monastic presbyterate were held together in one great organization. When the papacy lost its power or capacity for successful mediation, the two elements of Mediæval Christianity fell apart, and have since remained under different forms of church government, with no visible organic unity. In the present day the question has arisen whether the settlement of the Reformation was a final one.[1]

[1] It throws light upon the Oxford Movement, if it is regarded as a monastic protest within the Church of England against its secular aspect as

The question of administration embarrassed the German Reformers. Luther handed over to the state the function of episcopal supervision, which in turn intrusted its duties to a consistory of clergy. The arrangement was not intended to be permanent, but was regarded as meeting the existing emergency. But both Melanchthon and Luther felt that while they had provided the highest place for the preaching of the Word, they had not adequately provided for the oversight and administration of ecclesiastical affairs. In the Reformed Church, the function of preaching also assumed the place of highest honor, while administration appears as somewhat subordinate, inasmuch as it is shared by the ministry with the ruling elders met together in synods.[1] In the Church of England, the presbyter was restored to a footing of equality with the bishop, in so far as the function of preaching was treated as the highest prerogative of the ministry. The English form for making a presbyter was modelled after the Latin form for making a bishop. In both cases in the Anglican ordinal there is an examination of the *ordinand* before the congregation; to the presbyter is restored the privilege, which was his in the Apostolic age, of defending the faith; to both alike is handed the Bible as the object of study and the source of authority in teaching. But the rank of the bishop, who has the functions of ordination and

the established church which, during the eighteenth century, had been predominant. This point of view is confirmed by the language of its leader, the late Dr. Pusey, who writes regarding the bishops: "I am not disturbed, because I never attached any weight to the bishops. It was perhaps the difference between Newman and me: he threw himself upon the bishops and they failed him; I threw myself on the English Church and the Fathers as under God her support" (*Life*, Vol. III., p. 163).

[1] In his system of church government, Calvin assigned the higher dignity to the pastors and teachers who preach the Word and administer the sacraments. But he also provides in an explicit way for the function of administration of ecclesiastical affairs, which consists of two departments, — government and care of the poor: "By these governors I understand seniors selected from the people to unite with the bishops [*i.e.* presbyters, for the terms 'bishop,' 'presbyter,' 'pastor,' and 'teachers' are regarded by Calvin as synonymous] in pronouncing censures and exercising discipline. . . . From the beginning, therefore, each church had its senate, composed of pious, grave, and venerable men, in whom was lodged the power of correcting faults" (*Instit.*, B. IV., c. 3, § 9).

confirmation, and of supervision also, as the executive of ecclesiastical law, is higher than that of the presbyter. He is ordained like the presbyter, but is further consecrated to his episcopal office.

From one point of view the form of ecclesiastical organization was regarded by the Reformers as a matter of supreme importance, inasmuch as the rejection of papal headship was deemed essential to the constitution of a pure church. This was a common tie which bound the Protestant churches together in mutual sympathy. Beyond this point there was little discussion of the form which organization should assume, nor was the outward form regarded as essential, so long as the true doctrine was maintained. Hence the Church of England regarded the ministry of the Continental churches as valid, and those who had not received episcopal ordination were allowed to minister in her parishes.[1]

VI

The word 'Protestant' was not regarded in the sixteenth century as the antithesis of Catholic. Rather did the Reformers, English, German, and Swiss, claim the word 'Catholic' as a true and fitting designation of the Protestant churches. They had rejected the Roman definition of

[1] "During the reign of Elizabeth and James I., the clergy of non-episcopal churches outside England were, in the opinion of the day, accounted regularly ordained priests; under Elizabeth, and temporarily after the restoration of episcopacy under Charles II., priests who had not been ordained by bishops were allowed to officiate even within the Church of England" (Makower, *Constitutional History of the Church of England*, § 18, who also cites the evidence). Cf. also Keble's Preface to his edition of Hooker's *Works;* Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, in *Commentary on the Thirty-nine Articles*, Art. V.; Lord Bacon in *Works*, Spedding, Ellis and Heath ed., VIII. 87; Archbishop Bramhall, in *Introduction to Works;* citations to the same effect, from Bridges, Bishop of Oxford; Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury; Cooper, Bishop of Lincoln; Bishop Cosin, Archbishop Ussher, and others, in Goode, *On Orders.* For the ordination of the Scotch bishops in 1611, cf. Spotiswood, *His. of Church and State in Scotland;* episcopal consecration was then given to presbyters who had not received episcopal ordination. See also *Collection of Records* appended to Burnet, *History of the Reformation*, Bk. III., § 21, for the discussion of the question of *Orders* in the reign of Henry VIII.

catholicity, as consisting in union and agreement with Rome; but the Greek etymology of the word gave them their favorite definition, — that the Catholic church was universal in the sense of including all faithful disciples of Christ in every age and place, in this world and in another. Hence they denied that the Roman church was or could be catholic in the true sense, and affirmed that catholicity was the essential mark of Protestantism. In this sense they recited the creeds which called for faith in the Holy Catholic Church. With this church they were sure they were united in the deepest way and by ties that could not be broken.[1]

But there was another sense, a more exact and historical sense, in which the Protestant churches could claim possession of catholicity. They received in common the Canon of Scripture as containing the teaching of Christ and His

[1] The two creeds, the 'Apostles'' and 'Nicene' as they are called, were retained by all the Protestant churches. But in Germany, the word 'Catholic' was translated into its equivalent *Christliche*, by Luther in his *Small Catechism;* in the *Heidelberg Catechism* it reads *allgemeine christliche Kirche*. Cf. Calvin, *Institutes*, IV. 1, §§ 1, 3, for his commentary on the creed, where he vigorously contends for the necessity of union with the Catholic church understood in this larger sense. The Church of England retained the word 'Catholic' in the creeds, as elsewhere in her offices, but it was defined in the Prayer for all Conditions of Men, as "all those who profess and call themselves Christians," and again as in the Litany, "the holy church universal"; in Canon 55, of the Canons of 1604: "Ye shall pray for Christ's Holy Catholic Church, that is, for the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the whole world." Cf. *The Catechism* in Becon, *Works*, p. 42 (Parker Soc. ed.), for a representative statement of the Anglican doctrine in this period: "*Father.* Why is this church called 'Catholic' or universal? *Son.* Because it is not bound to one certain place, kingdom, or empire, but is dispersed throughout the whole world; so that in all places God hath His elect and chosen people which believe in Him, call on His holy name and worship Him according to His word even in spirit and in truth." Jewell, Bishop of Salisbury, also contended for the catholicity of Protestant doctrines, as given by Christ and His apostles, as well as for the translation of 'Catholic' into 'universal' as its true equivalent. Cf. *Works*, I. 426; II. 1030. Other Church of England writers took the same view: "*M.* To what purpose dost thou call this church Catholic? *S.* It is as much as if I called it universal" (Nowell, *Works*, p. 173 [Par. Soc. ed.]); "Assuredly that man will never be a good Catholic whom well-collated Scriptures cannot bring to adopt a Catholic opinion" (Whitaker, *Works*, p. 480); "*Romana ecclesia non est Catholica ecclesia*" (Whitgift, *Works*, III., p. 622).

Apostles. Luther raised doubts regarding certain books of the New Testament, but the Lutheran Church, as well as the Reformed Church and the Church of England, took the New Testament as the authoritative source of Christian truth.[1] Hence they could claim an Apostolic succession, according to the definition which had been given of it by Irenæus[2] in the second century, when the Christian faith was denied by the Gnostic and other teachers, and when the test and foundation of catholicity consisted in holding by the teaching which had descended from the Apostles. There is also still another historical application of the term 'Catholic' to the Protestant churches, which is justified by their attitude in the age of the Reformation, and to which reference will be made in a later chapter.[3]

[1] Cf. *Thirty-nine Articles*, Art. VIII.: "The Nicene Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, ought thoroughly to be believed and received; for they may be proved by most sure warrant of Holy Scripture."

[2] Cf. *ante*, p. 94.

[3] There are various private interpretations of catholicity, all of which, however they may differ, agree in regarding the word as the designation of the ideal or perfect church, but for none of which can be claimed any universal sanction. Such was the Vincentian theory originating in Gaul in the fifth century, which postulates as the test of Catholic truth, *Quod semper, ubique et ab omnibus;* a canon, to say the least of it, very difficult of application. Coleridge was the author of a certain popular use of the term 'Catholic': "The present adherents of the Church of Rome are not, in my judgment, Catholics. We are the Catholics. We can prove that we hold the doctrines of the primitive church for the first three hundred years. . . . A person said to me lately, 'But you will for civility's sake *call* them *Catholics*, will you not?' I answered that I would not tell a lie upon any, much less upon so solemn an occasion. The adherents of the Church of Rome, I repeat, are not Catholic Christians. If they are, then it follows that we Protestants are heretics and schismatics, etc." (*Table Talk*, April 29, 1823). According to Bishop Ken, the Catholic church maintained its existence until the schism between the Greek and Latin churches. The High Anglican view asserts that episcopacy is of the essence of catholicity. This view was first broached by some of the Caroline divines in the seventeenth century in opposition to the Puritans, and has been reasserted by the leaders of the Oxford Movement, *e.g.* Newman and Pusey. For its statement and defence see Gore, *The Church and the Ministry;* also *Tracts for the Times*, *passim*. Others again of the same school regard the epithet 'Catholic' as distinctive of the church before the Reformation, and therefore as the antithesis of 'Protestant.'

The Protestant world, differing as it does in so many aspects, whether in doctrine or organization or worship, from the Mediæval world out of which it grew, does yet retain a striking resemblance, in external appearance at least, to the Christendom which it superseded. The larger divisions of Protestantism still perpetuate the various attitudes of monasticism, so far as they were expressions of certain permanent tendencies in religion, each of which needs and seeks the shelter of institutional life, all of which together, and no one of them apart from the rest, are competent to represent the workings of the soul under the tuition of the Spirit. It was the wisdom of the papacy, and its signal service to humanity, that it recognized them all and tolerated them all,—not only the greater orders, but those seemingly countless divisions and subdivisions which we cease to follow, so minute are their ramifications, but each standing nevertheless for some one special doctrine of the faith or historic fact in the life of Christ, some single truth which the world seemed in danger of neglecting. And if a human institution like the papacy could rise to such an expanded view of the demands of the religious life, and conserve their utterance, much more can the Protestant world, always under the headship of Christ and sharing in His life, recognize this unity amidst great diversity. From this point of view we may remind ourselves how the divisions of Protestantism still retain reminders of a world which they have outgrown. In the Lutheran Church may be traced the spirit of the Augustinian order, with which its origin was so clearly connected,—the reverence for Augustine and for that theology and type of piety with which his name is forever associated. The Reformed Church has points of affinity with the Dominican order,—in its wide diffusion in every land, in the importance which, like the Lutheran Church, it attaches to doctrine and to preaching, but also to organization, upon which it lays a deeper stress. The Methodist Church is almost a reproduction of the Franciscan order, and Wesley as it were the successor of Francis of Assisi, taking the world for his parish,

with his ardent love of souls, differing from the Reformed Church on those points in which the Franciscan differed from the Dominican, and pre-eminently in all that relates to or flows from the doctrine of the freedom of the human will. The Church of England perpetuates more distinctly the secular church of the Middle Ages, but in its capacity as a national church has included more than one variety of monastic attitude. In the High Anglican school may be seen the reproduction of the spirit of Clugny, with its doctrine of church authority, and its love of a rich, elaborate ritual or its devotion to an imposing architecture; or, on the other hand, in the Low Church party, as it is called, we catch the tone of Bernard of Clairvaux, who regarded ritual with indifference and impressed upon the Cistercian order the sin of spending money upon the details of gorgeous rites, or the adornment of the houses for the worship of God with meaningless architectural decoration, who gave the inward experience of religion the highest place, accompanied only with the worship which is in spirit and in truth. The Congregational Church, which has been prolific in offshoots organized on the same principle of the independence of the local church, appears like a reversion to the earlier and simpler organization of the Benedictine order, when each monastery was independent and complete in itself,—an order which has rivalled, if not surpassed, the Dominican in learning and scholarship and in devotion to Christian literature. It would be impossible to enumerate them all, but the Baptist Church may be mentioned with its logical insistence upon what theories imply, with its endeavor to secure a more complete discipline and realization of all that a Protestant church involves, with its recognition in an emphatic way of the significance of the Old Testament in its relation to the New,—in this attitude there is a suggestion of one of the larger but more rigid monastic orders, the Carmelite, which claimed as its founder a great prophet of the older dispensation, Elijah upon Mount Carmel, an order whose extensive membership exhibited a devotion and enthusiasm for their monastic foundation which is not

surpassed in monastic annals. And how many other lesser orders there were, who had learned the truth that God speaks to the soul in silence, and that in silent prayer and silent worship the Spirit is active, helping the infirmities of men in those groanings which cannot be uttered. If the monastic orders were one under the headship of the papacy, these Protestant orders are quite as surely one under Christ, holding to the Catholic faith also, of which the essence is the God-man, a divine-human leader, Jesus the Son of the living God.

It requires only the exercise of the spiritual imagination to see and to feel that the Protestant world is the product of world-forces which are still active, that the evils which we bemoan have not yet bred essential weakness in its constitution, or impaired it by failure or decay. A recent writer, who was familiar with the history of the church before and since the Reformation, has enumerated these evils: "The loss of that organic unity which served in bygone days as a powerful evidence in aid of Christian truth; the intermission of fraternal fellowship between communities related to each other, not by blood and language merely, but in some essential points by creed; the sad dismemberment of families; the multiplication of parties, schisms, and factions rising out of religious prejudice and often issuing in religious wars; the growth of mental habits leading either to indifferentism on one side or to interdicted speculations on the other; the diffusion of an egotistic, self-complacent, and subjective spirit, making light of all ecclesiastical traditions and exciting controversies whose vibrations are still felt in almost every part of Europe,— these were some of the immediate and, it may be, necessary accompaniments of struggles which then rose between the ancient and modern modes of thought, between the Mediæval and Reforming principles." "But," he continues,

"While confessing and deploring such results, we should, on the other hand, reflect that, in the present stage of man's existence, great advantages must generally be purchased by corresponding sacrifices; and that if we fairly balance gain with loss, the Reformation is

to be esteemed among our very choicest blessings. It recovered what is far more precious than ecclesiastical unity, — the primitive and Apostolic faith. From it accordingly has dated a new era in the moral progress of the Western nations, and the spiritual development of man. It has replaced him in the liberty wherewith Christ had made him free. It has unloosed the trammels that oppressed not only his understanding but his conscience. It has led to the rejection of that semi-Judaism in thought and feeling, which, however it was overruled for good in training the barbaric nations of the north, was, notwithstanding, a melancholy relapse into the servile posture of the Hebrew, as distinguished from the free and filial spirit that should characterize the children of God. Above all, the Reformation vindicates for our Blessed Lord the real Headship of the Church, exalting Him as the one source of life and righteousness, and thereby placing saints, and priests, and sacraments in their true subordination. Personal faith in Him, the Reconstructor of humanity, the living Way unto the Father, was now urged with emphasis unequalled since the age of St. Augustine; and this quickening of man's moral consciousness imparted a new stimulus to individual effort. Doubtless many wild exaggerations followed, and still follow, in the track of the great movement, partly owing to the natural waywardness of men, and partly to the irrepressible force of the revulsion caused by hatred of the ancient superstitions. Yet in spite of all such drawbacks, it is manifest that the reformed are, as a rule, entitled to rank higher than the unreformed communities, surpassing these not only in the vigor of their intellectual faculties and their material prosperity, but also in the social, moral, and religious elevation of the people. Exactly where the leaders of the Reformation were true to their first principles, and struggled to preserve the middle way, — in which the doctrine of authority is made consistent with individual freedom, — in the same proportion we behold their labors crowned with rich and permanent success; and exactly where the seed they scattered found a peaceful and congenial soil, we recognize the most intelligent and manly, the most truthful, upright, and magnanimous people in the world."[1]

[1] *A History of the Christian Church during the Reformation, by Charles Hardwick, M.A., late fellow of St. Catherine's College, Divinity Lecturer at King's College, and Christian Advocate in the University of Cambridge*, 2d ed. revised by Francis Procter, M.A., London, 1865, pp. 10–12. See, also, Fisher, Professor G. P., *History of the Reformation*, c. xv., on the *Relation of Protestantism to Culture and Civilization*, which contains many profound reflections on the significance of the Protestant attitude.

Book II

THE CATHOLIC CREEDS AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF DOCTRINE

CHAPTER I

THE CATHOLIC CREEDS[1]

In the foregoing discussion of the organization of the church, differences in the ecclesiastical order appear as related to the development of Christian civilization, as well as to the fuller and richer assertion of the Christian life. The conflicting motives of solidarity and individualism, of imperialism which knows no distinction of race or country, and of nationality which brings freedom to those of common kindred, have been cherished by the antagonistic tendencies in ecclesiastical institutions, until they were revealed in their full significance in the age of the Reformation. We must judge of institutions by the results they have created. In their final manifestation may be read more clearly than in their professed aim or their formal declaration of principles what has been the deeper, though often unconscious, motive of their existence. The life of Luther and the later intellectual history of Germany is a commentary on monasticism, interpreting its higher spirit better than the rules of the Benedictine order. The Anglican Reformation and the later history of England best disclose the purposes of

[1] Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom;* Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der apostolisch-katholischen Kirche;* Caspari, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols;* article on *Creeds* by Swainson in *Dict. Chris. Biog.*, also his *Literary History of the Nicene and Apostles' Creeds;* Harvey, *History and Theology of the Three Creeds;* Lumby, *History of the Creeds;* Heurtley, *Harmonia Symbolica;* Hefele, *History of the Councils.*

the episcopate in its bearing upon religion and civilization. The Reformed Church, from its centre at Geneva growing into a cosmopolitan organization, which was at home in every country, is a disclosure of the purpose at which monasticism was aiming, but was unable to accomplish in consequence of its limitations. Only in the long process of the ages is the meaning revealed of much which seems incongruous or alien to the Christian spirit. In a modified form the institutions still persist, which in their Mediæval analogies seem foreign and repulsive to the modern mind.

In turning now to the ancient creeds, the same questions call for an answer, Why they took the shape they did, What relation they sustain to that increasing purpose which exists beneath the surface of consciousness, and reveals its presence and its power in the great historical moments of human manifestation. What the creeds affirm has its connection with the political and social aspects of life, no less than with the religious, or may carry as in a germ the content of philosophical or speculative attitudes toward the world. While they are primarily the statements of simple personal faith, or of historical facts in the life of Christ, whose recitation in worship serves a religious end, they may also be the war-songs of great victories in which the fate of civilization was at issue. What the creeds omit is significant also, as well as what they contain. When the age of creed-making was over, it was followed by an age when systems of theology were developed, expanding the content of the human soul in its relation toward God with a fulness and richness which has found its adequate symbol in some vast cathedral. If the creeds may be regarded as the products of the Catholic church, as the expression of the episcopate seeking that which was common and necessary for all the world; systems of theology, on the other hand, were first developed by monks as in the Middle Ages, by the presbyterate inheriting the traditions of the ancient teacher, an Origen or a Jerome, building indeed upon the creeds, but more concerned about their deeper interpretation. The modern

Protestant churches surpass the ancient Catholic church in possessing not only the creeds, but the results of theological inquiry, embodied in Confessions of Faith. The Catholic church dwelt mainly upon the theology of the incarnation, but when monasticism arose another issue was slowly developed, which finally took form as the theology of the atonement. The incarnation speaks to man in his relations to the race of humanity; the atonement is the application of the incarnation to the needs of the individual soul. There are two small books whose influence has been out of all proportion to their size, the two most representative books in Christian literature, — Athanasius, *De Incarnatione Verbi*, and Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo*, one written by the patriarchal bishop of a national church, the other by a monastic presbyter in his lonely cell.

I

There are three creeds, which out of many have survived by gaining the support of popular recognition, none of which are strictly entitled to the names by which they are known, — the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, and the Athanasian Creed. Of these the only one which can be said to possess œcumenical authority is the so-called Creed of Nicæa, which was set forth with the formal approval of the Council of Chalcedon in 451 A.D., which to-day is recited in the liturgies of the Greek and Roman and Anglican churches, and which, if not in liturgical use in the Lutheran and Reformed churches, retains their confidence and approval. The Apostles' Creed is unknown in the Greek and Oriental churches and has never had the sanction of conciliar authority. The creed called after Athanasius is a symbol still more restricted in its use, and since the Reformation has failed to commend itself to the popular mind. Its historical significance lies in the fact that it boldly identifies the Catholic faith with the doctrine of the Trinity.

The Apostles' Creed[1] is the oldest of the three, and its

[1] Rufinus, *Expositio in Symbolum Apostolorum*, in Migne, *Patro.*, XXI.; Ussher, *De Symbolo Apostolico;* M. Nicholas, *Le Symbole des*

date, in its original form, may be placed about the middle of the second century. In its structure it is the expansion of the baptismal formula,—the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. This creed first read as follows:

"I believe in God the Father Almighty; and in Jesus Christ His only Son, our Lord; who was born of the Holy Spirit and Mary the Virgin; under Pontius Pilate was crucified and buried; on the third day He rose from the dead; He ascended into heaven; He sitteth on the right hand of the Father; from thence He shall come to judge the living and the dead; and in the Holy Spirit; the holy church; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the flesh." [1]

Nothing is known regarding the origin of this creed, beyond the fact that it was originally written in Greek. The time when it was written is a matter of inference, but may be regarded as established. Whether it originated at Rome or was imported from Asia Minor is uncertain. Why it should have taken the shape it did, or whether it reflects the theological moods of the hour, are questions not determined with certainty. In the New Testament there are given brief confessions which reveal no traces of controversy, or of protest against erroneous conceptions. Such was Peter's confession: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God"; or the baptismal confession in Acts viii. 37, whose genuineness is doubtful: "I believe that Jesus is the Son of the living God"; or again the form of words

Apôtres; Westcott, *Apostles' Creed;* Baron, *Greek Origin of Apostles' Creed;* Kattenbusch, *Das Apostolische Symbol; seine Entstehung, sein geschichtliches Sinn, seine ursprüngliche Stellung in Kultus u. in der Theologie d. Kirche*, 1895.

[1] Cf. Iren., *C. Haer.* 1, c. 10, § 1; Tertull., *Praes. Haer.*, c. xiii. The creed of Cyprian is much briefer, and is a reduction probably like that of Novatian, neither of them giving the creed in full, but taking it for granted. Cf. Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, II., pp. 20, 21; also Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole*, etc., p. 74. For the origin of the Roman creed, cf. Caspari, III., pp. 267 ff. Dr. Hort suggested its Oriental origin on the ground of the expression μονογενὴς υἱός, in his *Two Dissertations*, etc. In the lately discovered *Apology* of Aristides, a Christian philosopher at Athens in the reign of Antoninus Pius, may be found the materials, which, when placed together as by Professor Rendel Harris, closely resemble the Roman symbol, and must be nearly contemporaneous with it. Cf. *Apol.* in Greek version, cc. 14, 15, in Vol. IX., in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, ed. Chris. Lit. Co.; cf. also Scott, *The Nicene Theology*, p. 328.

given by St. Paul: "I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures and that he was buried and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures." Whether or not the Apostles' Creed contemplated the existing situation in the church, or its object was to overcome Gnosticism and Montanism by the assertion of fundamental Christian teaching, it was adapted to this end and may be regarded as the characteristic utterance of the Catholic church when it realized its great mission to the world. In the writings of Ignatius (110–117 A.D.) there is an earlier confession of faith closely resembling the Apostles' Creed, whose object was to overcome that mode of thinking known as Docetism, which denied the objective reality of the person of Christ, refusing to believe that He possessed a human body, or that He actually died upon the cross. Hence Ignatius dwelt upon historic facts in opposition to the transcendental scepticism:

"Jesus Christ, who has descended from David, and was also of Mary; who was *truly* born and did eat and drink. He was *truly* persecuted under Pontius Pilate; He was *truly* crucified, and *truly* died, in the sight of beings in heaven and on earth and under the earth. He was also *truly* raised from the dead."[1]

The Apostles' Creed furnishes also the model which was universally followed, — the expansion of the baptismal formula. About the threefold name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost clustered the statements regarding the distinctive work of each, which, as in the rules of faith given by Irenæus and Tertullian, might vary without affecting the substance of the creed. The distinctive feature of the Apostles' Creed was in the historical character of the expansion connected with the name of Christ. Herein lay its value, that it professed to deal with actual events or facts capable of being fixed as to place or time, of which the report might be attested by those who knew, and further might be handed down in tradition from one man to another. It was this feature of the creed which com-

[1] Cf. *Ad Trall.* ix.; also *Ad Mag.* xi.; *Ad Smyr.* i.

mended it to the Western churches, whether in Italy, Gaul, or North Africa. It required no profound intellectual preparation in order to its comprehension; it spoke the language of no speculative school; it did not deal with theories about the person of Christ, but laid the stress on the supreme circumstances in the life on earth of the incarnate Son of God, His birth, His death, His resurrection, and His ascension to the Father.

There is no evidence that this creed was known in the Eastern churches before the time of Origen. Clement of Alexandria († 220) makes no reference to it, nor does he seem to be aware of its existence. But Origen († 254) had been to Rome and while there may have become acquainted with it, as also with the belief that it had been composed by the twelve Apostles, from whom it had descended by the continuous succession of the episcopate. In writing his theological treatise on *First Principles*, Origen gives the Roman Creed in its distinctive features, but with a free rendering of his own, to adapt it to a somewhat different theological atmosphere. He also interprets the creed as if its design were to overcome Gnostic or Docetic heresies, amplifying its terse expressions by saying that Christ was *truly* born and did *truly* suffer, did *truly* die and *truly* rise from the dead. The difference in tone and spirit between Rome and Alexandria is also apparent in Origen's conviction that the interpretation of the creed is a matter of vital importance. Over against the claim of tradition he vindicates the right of free theological inquiry:

"The holy Apostles, in preaching the faith of Christ, delivered themselves with the utmost clearness on certain points which they believed to be necessary to every one, even to those who seemed somewhat dull in the investigation of divine knowledge; leaving, however, the grounds of their statements to be examined into by those who should deserve the excellent gifts of the Spirit, and who, especially by means of the Holy Spirit Himself, should obtain the gifts of language, of wisdom, and of knowledge; while on other subjects they merely stated the facts that things were so, keeping silence as to the manner or origin of their existence, clearly in order that the more zealous of their successors, who should be lovers of wisdom, might have a sub-

ject on which to display the fruit of their talents,—those persons, I mean, who should prepare themselves to be fit and worthy receivers of wisdom."[1]

The origin of the creeds in the Eastern church is obscure. They are later than the Roman creed, and there is a certain resemblance between them; but whether they have followed it or have expanded the baptismal formula without knowledge of it is uncertain. The Eastern creeds betray the influence of the rising controversy on the relation of the Son to the Father. They began to appear toward the close of the third century and from that time until after the middle of the fifth century there was an epoch of creed-making which rivals in activity and fertility the period in Protestant history which followed the Reformation. While the church in the West had but one creed, that of Rome, which is substantially reproduced by Irenæus and Tertullian and others, the Eastern church was more independent and its creeds may have many centres. The oldest of these is that of Gregory Thaumaturgus (c. 233–270), a disciple of Origen and Bishop of Neocæsarea. Its tone is profoundly theological and in this respect it is representative of the many Eastern creeds of later date. In Bishop Bull's translation it reads:

"There is one God, Father of Him who is the living Word, subsisting Wisdom and Power and Eternal Impress. Perfect Begetter of the Perfect, Father of the only begotten Son. There is one Lord, Alone of the alone, God of God, Impress and Image of the Godhead, the operative Word; Wisdom comprehensive of the system of the universe, and Power productive of the whole creation; true Son of true Father, Invisible of Invisible, and Incorruptible of Incorruptible, and Immortal of Immortal, and Eternal of Eternal. And there is one Holy Ghost, who hath his being of God, who hath appeared through the Son, Image of the Son, Perfect of the Perfect; Life, the Cause of all them that live; Holy Fountain, Holiness, the Bestower of sanctification, in whom is manifested God the Father, who is over all and in all, and God the Son, who is through all. A perfect Trinity, not divided nor alien in glory and eternity and dominion."[2]

[1] Origen, *De Princip.* in *Pref.* 3.

[2] Cf. Art. *Gregorius Thaumaturgus* in Smith and Wace, *Dict. Chris. Biog.* for discussion of genuineness of this creed. It is defended by Caspari in appendix to *Quellen*, etc. For the creed of Lucian of Antioch

A peculiar interest attaches to the creed of the church in Cæsarea because it was presented by Eusebius, its bishop at the Council of Nicæa, as a summary of the Christian faith, which "we received from the bishops before us in our first catechetical instruction and when we were baptized." This creed was as follows:

"We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things both visible and invisible, and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, God of God, Light of Light, Life of Life, the only begotten Son, the First-born of every Creature, begotten of the Father before all worlds, by whom also all things were made. Who for our salvation was made flesh, and lived amongst men, and suffered, and rose again on the third day, and ascended to the Father, and shall come in glory to judge the quick and the dead. And we believe in One Holy Ghost."[1]

Such was the basis of the famous symbol known as the Nicene Creed. But this creed of Cæsarea was not acceptable to the Council because the Arians professed themselves willing to receive it. It was therefore amended by additions which the Arians were unwilling to accept and thus took form as the original creed of the Council of Nicæa. With the additions and certain minor changes, it was as follows:

"We believe in *one* God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things both visible and invisible.

"And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, only begotten *that is to say of the substance of the Father,* God of God, Light of Light, *very God of very God, begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father* [ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί], by whom all things were made, *both things in heaven and things in earth,* who for us men and for our salvation came down and was made flesh, and was made man, suffered, and rose again on the third day; went up into the heavens, and is to come again to judge the quick and the dead.

"And in the Holy Ghost.

"But those that say 'there was when He was not,' and that 'He came into existence from what was not,' or who profess that the Son

(† c. 112) see Mansi, *Conc.*, III. 398, Hefele, II., p. 77 (Eng. Trans.), and Schaff in *Ch. His.*, II., p. 537.

[1] Cf. Athanasius, *De Decr. Syn. Nic.* 32; Socrates, *H. E.*, i. 8; Hort, *Dissert.*, p. 56; Stanley, *His. of East. Ch.*, pp. 226 ff

of God is of a different 'subsistence,' or 'substance,' or that He is created, or changeable, or variable, are anathematized by the Catholic church."[1]

There is another ancient Oriental creed to which a deeper interest attaches than to the creed of Cæsarea as given by Eusebius: the creed of the church at Jerusalem, which first appears in the Catechetical Lectures of Cyril (c. 350), though its age must be greater than the date of its first appearance. Within recent years the important discovery has been made, that what is now known and recited as the Nicene Creed rests for its base upon the creed of the church of Jerusalem, which has been revised and enlarged and in its final shape has superseded the creed of Nicæa. It has been for ages the received view, that the original creed set forth at Nicæa was expanded at the Second General Council held at Constantinople in 381 by the addition of all that follows the sentence, 'I believe in the Holy Ghost,' with which the Nicene symbol terminated, as also by the other additions in the body of the creed. But it has now been established on critical grounds that the Second General Council did not touch the creed of Nicæa but reaffirmed it as it was first proclaimed, as if it were intended to remain an unique document permanent and unalterable. What happened at Constantinople which may have given rise to the view that the Nicene Creed was there enlarged, as well as reaffirmed, was the presentation to the council by some individual, probably the bishop Cyril of Jerusalem, of a creed or confession of faith, whose object was to show that he was in sympathy with the Nicene faith. Cyril of Jerusalem had for some years been affiliated with the semi-Arian school, who were unwilling to approve the 'Homoöusion.' At some moment, previous to the meeting of the council, he had given in his adherence to the Athanasian doctrine, and in a creed which was en-

[1] Mansi, VI. 957. For the additions to the creed, see Hort, *Dissert.*, pp. 54 ff., and for a comparison of the creeds of Cæsarea and Nicæa, pp. 138, 139. It was Dr. Hort's opinion that the Nicene Creed was regarded by the council as a theological formula, and not intended for a baptismal confession or for use in public worship (p. 108).

larged on the base of the original creed of Jerusalem he may have borne witness to the change in his attitude. The creed of Jerusalem about the year 350, as found in Cyril, read as follows:

"We believe in one God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible; And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father, very God before all ages, by whom all things were made; who was made flesh and became man; was crucified and was buried; rose on the third day; and ascended into the heavens, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father; and will come again in glory to judge the living and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end; And in one Holy Ghost, the paraclete, who spake in the prophets. And in one baptism of repentance for the remission of sins; and in one holy Catholic Church; and in the resurrection of the flesh and in life everlasting."

When and by whom this creed was afterwards enlarged remains uncertain; it may have been by Cyril himself, as Dr. Hort has suggested, but in its enlarged form it is found for the first time in the *Ancoratus* of Epiphanius, written about the year 374, and this enlarged form was designated by him as the Nicene Creed. It looks as if this creed of Epiphanius had been growing in popular use, and when presented by Cyril to the Council at Constantinople as evidence of his orthodoxy, it was approved. This creed which Cyril presented in 381, and which is found substantially in the *Ancoratus*, and which the Council approved, was as follows:

"We believe in one God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth and of all things visible and invisible.

"And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the only begotten, of the Father, begotten before all ages; Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, consubstantial with the Father, by whom all things were made; who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate of the Holy Ghost and Mary the Virgin, and was made man; He was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate and suffered and was buried; and rose again the third day according to the scriptures; and ascended into heaven and sitteth on the right hand of the Father; and shall come again with glory to judge the quick and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end.

"And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord, the Life Giver, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is wor-

shipped and glorified, who spake through the prophets. In one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church; we acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins; we look for the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come. Amen."

This creed, which Cyril is supposed to have presented to the Council at Constantinople as his personal confession of faith and on the presentation of which he was acquitted by the council of any accusation or suspicion, has become known in history as the Nicene Creed. When the confusion between these creeds began, or at what time the creed of Cyril was substituted for the Nicene symbol, has not been determined. In 431, at the Council of Ephesus, no mention was made of any other creed than that set forth at Nicæa in 325, which was recited in its original form and confirmed. The same Council also formulated the resolution that "no one should be allowed to present or write or compose any other creed than that which was definitely framed by the holy fathers at Nicæa with the aid of the Holy Spirit," under penalty of deposition or anathema (*Canon* vii.). But at the Fourth General Council held at Chalcedon in 451, the creed of Jerusalem, enlarged as it may have been by Cyril or as found substantially in the *Ancoratus* of Epiphanius, was presented to the assembled bishops as a creed which had been composed and authoritatively put forth by the one hundred and fifty fathers at Constantinople, seventy years before. There was discussion and opposition when the creed was thus presented,[1] but all that is important to note here is that the Council of Chalcedon still distinguished between the creed of Nicæa and that which was now called the creed of Constantinople, though allowing the latter to take its place by the side of the former. At some moment unknown in the age that followed the Council of Chalcedon, the latter creed was substituted for the former, and invested with all the dignity and authority of the Council of Nicæa, and thus has come down in history.[2]

[1] Cf. Mansi, VI., pp. 630 ff.; VII., pp. 22 ff.

[2] Cf. Hort, *Dissertation on the Constantinopolitan Creed;* Harnack, in Herzog, *R.E.*, Vol. VIII., Art. *Konstantinopolitanisches Symbol,*

The expanded creed triumphed in the churches and superseded the older creed of Nicæa by virtue of its own intrinsic merit. Its association with the church of Jerusalem is more precious than the tie of relationship between the original creed of Nicæa, and the church at Cæsarea. But it also has its close connection with the first great Christian council, in that it quotes from the creed of Nicæa its most striking clause, "Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, of one substance with the Father." It is a more complete creed in consequence of its introduction of the doctrine of the Two Natures, as also in its expansion in the latter part of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. It assimilates the early Roman creed with the creeds of the East, and thus furnished a symbol acceptable to the entire church; and there was a gain when the anathemas appended to the symbol of Nicæa were dropped as incongruous with the spirit of devotion. It does not bristle with the language of theological controversy as did the creed which it supplanted. It possesses a musical rhythm and melodious diction, where the older creed read somewhat roughly in consequence of the injection of purely theological phrases.[1] It sang itself, as it were, into the heart of the church, and became a constituent part of the language of devotion, at the moment of high exaltation in the ritual of the Eucharist.

The creed which had won its way in the East to general acceptance and become known as the Nicene Creed, proved equally acceptable in the West, supplanting for a time at least the Roman symbol known as the Apostles' Creed. The history of the latter is obscure. It fell into disuse at Rome, as it appears, and when next encountered, it has been enlarged by several additions. It seems probable that the revision was made in Gaul, where, in its final shape, it is first found in the writings of Pirminius, a

who concludes that this creed, attributed to Constantinople, was presented by Cyril in his personal defence; also Swainson, *The Nicene and Apostles' Creeds*, and Art. *Creed* in Smith and Wace, *Dict. Christ. Biog.*

[1] One of the theological phrases of the Nicene Creed was omitted altogether, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός, which had been inserted for the purpose of defining the foregoing words "the only begotten Son."

Gallic abbot († 758). In this shape it returned again to Rome, it was incorporated in the Breviary, and is known to-day as the Apostles' Creed. As it stands in Pirminius, the clauses of the creed are separately assigned to the Twelve Apostles as follows:

"Petrus: *Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem Creatorem coeli et terrae.* Joannes: *Et in Jesum Christum Filium ejus unicum Dominum nostrum.* Jacobus dixit: *Qui conceptus est de Spiritu sancto, natus ex Maria virgine.* Andreas ait: *Passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus, mortuus et sepultus.* Philippus dixit: *Descendit ad inferna.* Thomas ait: *Tertia die surrexit a mortuis.* Bartholomaeus ait: *Ascendit ad coelos, sedet ad dexteram Dei Patris omnipotentis.* Matthaeus ait: *Inde venturus judicare vivos et mortuos.* Jacobus Alphaei dixit: *Credo in Spiritum sanctum.* Simon Zelotes ait: *Sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam.* Judas Jacobi dixit: *Sanctorum communionem, remissionem peccatorum.* Item Thomas ait: *Carnis resurrectionem, vitam aeternam.*" [1]

These two creeds, which have now become known as the Apostles' and the Nicene, have undergone no change or revision since they received their final shape, the one in the eighth century, and the other in the fifth. But as has been shown, they are in substance older than their present form; they have their roots in remotest Christian antiquity; they seem almost coeval with the birth of the Christian church. The circumstances or conditions which attended their first utterance, as expansions of the baptismal formula, cannot be traced. These circumstances must have differed in the Eastern church from those of the West, — a difference which is reflected in the tone of the creeds, that of the East being more theological and speculative, while that of the West is practical and concrete. The one gives the prominence to the Christian idea or thought, the other to the historical facts, and thus they

[1] The Treatise of Pirminius, in which the creed thus enlarged is contained, is entitled *De singulis libris Canonicis scarapsus* (*i.e. Collectio*), and is given in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.*, Vol. LXXXIX, 1030 ff. For other legendary assignments of the parts of the creeds, cf. Hahn, pp. 67 ff. The additions to the early form of the creed consist in the phrases, 'Maker of heaven and earth,' 'He descended into hell,' 'the communion of saints,' the insertion of 'Catholic' as a designation of the church, and the words 'the life everlasting.' See Harnack, *Das Apost. Glaubensbekenntniss*, p. 28.

supplement each other when taken together. "A religion that is a true religion," as Coleridge has said, "must consist of ideas and facts both; not of ideas alone without facts, for then it would be a mere philosophy; nor of facts alone without ideas of which those facts are the symbols, or out of which they arise, or upon which they are grounded, for then it would be a mere history."

The difference in tone between the two creeds may explain in part why it was that after the Apostles' Creed had been supplanted at Rome and the Nicene Creed had been given the place of honor in the eucharistic office, the Apostles' Creed, after its expansion in Gaul, should have returned again to Rome and resumed its ancient importance. The moment when the Apostles' Creed was thus restored to Rome may coincide in a general way with the growing alienation between the Eastern and Western churches, when the church in the West was feeling an increasing sense of its own importance, when it even took the liberty of adding to the Nicene symbol the *filioque*, and of formulating anew, for its own use, the Catholic faith, as in the creed commonly called the Athanasian. While the Nicene Creed may possess a certain external authority which the Apostles' Creed cannot exhibit, inasmuch as it can claim the sanction of General Councils, yet the Apostles' Creed without this sanction has been received in the West as of equal prestige. While the Apostles' Creed is unknown in the Greek church, yet in Western Christendom it has become the baptismal Confession of Faith, and surpasses the Nicene symbol in its wide and almost general acceptation. It has become the creed of the laity, the briefest form in which the Christian faith has been presented.

The Nicene Creed has a grander and more majestic tone: it embodies the consciousness of victory of the Catholic faith; it recalls, as one recites it, the eventful moments in the history of the church. But it is theological and controversial even in the moderated form in which it has come down to us from the Fourth General Council. Its opening note, "I believe in *one* God," recalls the chal-

lenge of Christianity to the many gods of heathenism, and the long conflicts, the persecutions, which the church endured, until at last it became manifest that the one God was supreme in all the earth. The declaration of the one Lord Jesus Christ as consubstantial or of the same essence with the Father recalls the Arian controversy, in which this truth was denied. The emphatic language, "who came down and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary and was made man," was a challenge to the heathen world. The word 'incarnate' is a reminder of other controversies, about the double nature of the person of Christ, when the patriarchs of Constantinople and Alexandria — the theological schools of Antioch and Alexandria — were unable to agree as to the meaning of the incarnation, and the church was rent with dissensions which finally ultimated in schisms which have not yet been overcome. Another obscure and difficult controversy may be hinted at in the clause, "whose kingdom shall have no end," which reminds one of some of the more painful incidents in the progress of the conflict between Athanasius and his opponents. Again, a subtle theological principle is indicated in the clause which speaks of Christ as the "Light of Light" (Φῶς ἐκ Φωτός), in which the essence of Deity seems to be postulated as Light, which is and always has been the fundamental conviction of the Oriental church, as compared with the later theology of the West, which laid the stress upon the Will of God as the inmost of the divine attributes; or, still further, these three clauses, now so difficult to interpret by any one unfamiliar with ancient theosophic development, which, when they are translated literally, read, *God from* or *out of God, Light out of Light, Very God out of very God*, a reminder of the theories of emanation or evolution, which embarrassed ancient speculative systems, and which were overcome by the Christian doctrine of the incarnation, till these words as originally interpreted carried no longer their ancient emphasis, but have become equivalent to the coequality of the Son with the Father. And, again, in the doctrine concerning "The Holy Ghost, the Lord

and Giver of Life," one remembers that the clause "who proceedeth from the Father, who, with the Father and the Son together (or coequally), is worshipped and glorified" bears its protest against those who reduced the Holy Spirit to a creature, — supernatural, it is true, but called into existence by the Son; or, in "the *one* baptism for the remission of sins," the attention is called to painful discussions which agitated the church in the third century, as to whether the baptism by heretics was valid.

From these reminders of religious controversy or these enduring associations of conflicts and of victories in the Catholic church, the Apostle's Creed carries us back to an earlier age in which they had not as yet arisen, — the atmosphere of peace and simplicity. In its undogmatic character, it appeals more directly to the universal Christian instincts. Even in those clauses which were added to it in Gaul, by Pirminius or by some other writer, which the Nicene Creed does not contain, — "He descended into Hades," and "the communion of saints," — there is no association with controversy; they are the vistas of the spiritual imagination, whose significance has never been authoritatively defined or about which opinion has differed, but in which all may find the elements of divine hope and consolation.

CHAPTER II

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY — ITS PLACE IN HISTORY AND ITS RELATION TO HUMAN PROGRESS

I

It is the distinctive feature of ancient theology, that it fastened upon the Person of Christ as the essence of the Christian faith. We can conceive that a different course might have been followed, — that either the ethical teaching of Jesus as given in the Sermon on the Mount, or else the experience of St. Paul, which gave prominence to the atoning death of Christ in order to the forgiveness of sin, might have been regarded as the central dominating principle of the new religion. These important and vital aspects of Christianity were not, indeed, neglected by the ancient church, but they were subordinated to what was held as the supreme issue, — the Person of Christ, as concentrating in Himself the new life and the light that had come into the world. Those passages in the evangelical narratives which arrested attention, as the most marvellous words that had ever fallen from human lips, were such as these — "*Come unto me all ye that are weary and heavy laden and I will give you rest*"; "*Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them*"; "*I am the way and the truth and the life*"; "*I am the light of the world*"; "*I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.*" The doctrine of the incarnation of God in Christ, and the doctrine of the Trinity which gives it expression, became therefore in Greek theology, from the first, the all-absorbing theme, whether to the heart of faith or to the Christian intellect seeking for some adequate formula in which to embody the fulness of its conviction. But such a con-

viction in regard to the person of the founder of the Christian faith could not have existed without leaving deep and permanent impression upon Christian institutions. And it must also have had, in the nature of the case, an influence upon human progress and the development of the social order. For this reason the leading doctrines of Christianity demand a survey, however brief and cursory, in a history of the institutions which have been the outgrowth of the Christian spirit. It may not be possible to demonstrate the connection as having the relation of cause and effect, but at least it can be shown that the faith in Christ as the incarnate and coequal Son of God has never lost its hold upon the Christian consciousness, that it has been the antecedent of the changes which have modified, if not created, our modern civilization.[1]

The formula of the Trinity grew, like the Catholic creeds, out of the declaration of the divine name as given in the New Testament, — the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. In the writings of St. Paul, the threefold name appears at every turn, with every variety of utterance and application. It was the formula of benediction, — the love of the Father, the grace of Christ, the fellowship of the Spirit. It was the rule of the religious life, — through Him (Christ) we have access by one Spirit unto the Father. The three are presented as distinct, and yet associated in unity; the language used in speaking of each implies distinct personality; but unity is assumed as if they were one. They are represented as having distinct functions, but there is no scrupulous effort to maintain uniformity or consistency when describing their work; to each alike is ascribed the work of creation, of redemption, and sanctification, and yet it is also primarily the Father who creates, the Son who redeems, the Spirit who sanctifies. As the threefold divine name appears in the New Testament, so also it appears in the literature of the early church. There is distinction and discrimination, but unity is assumed. There is a certain gradation of rank, — it is the Father,

[1] For an interesting discussion of this point in some of its phases, cf. Bois, *Le Dogme Grec et la Civilization*, 1893.

the Son, and the Holy Ghost, but the three appear as co-equal in the possession of divine attributes.

The triune name of Deity in the Christian revelation corresponds with the large divisions of religious experience as they have been known in history, or as they existed in the Roman Empire at the coming of Christ. The ancient religions recognized a divine life in nature, some overarching providence which controls human destiny. If this divine life were identified with outward nature, or believed to be embodied in natural phenomena, we have the nature-religions as they are called, in which the various forces of nature were deified, or its most striking objects appeared to the imagination as worthy of worship. Sun, moon, and stars became objects of reverence in which some deity dwelt; there was a spirit in the ocean and in rivers, in mountain or forest, or in the under-world. Such was the Egyptian religion in its origin and history, where the divine life was worshipped as indwelling in the animal creation. There were, however, other religions, in which the conscience was more active, and the effort was made to separate the Divine Being from the work of His hands. Such was Judaism, whose history was one of conflict with the nature-religions, till it triumphed over the temptations they offered by the growing conviction that nature was under the power of God as its Creator, and by the steadfast refusal to identify Deity with His creation. But even beneath the nature-religions a similar effort may be detected to gain unity by postulating some central force to which the phenomena of nature were subordinated.

There was another religious attitude, of which Greek religion is the type, which magnified men and worshipped great heroes, calling them sons of God, holding them to be embodiments in some special degree of the divine life. While Greek religion did not disown the worship of nature as containing a divine life, yet it had risen so far above the nature-worships, that its favorite divinities were deified men, who had wrought great deeds in human history, or were distinguished above their fellows by the possession of rare endowments. Thus it contained the germ

of the truth that humanity exhibits in some higher, closer way than outward nature the manifestation or revelation of divine power and will.

There was a third attitude, which was never without its witnesses in any of the forms of old religion, which may be defined, in a general way, as the recognition of some divine voice speaking in the mysterious depths of the human soul, disturbing the inner life and manifesting itself in strange and even repulsive ways, — those inward motions of the human spirit, which do not rest contented with the manifestations of Deity in outward nature or in the favored sons of humanity, which do not seek to appease the divine by external offerings in sacrifice, but which prescribe the offering of the inward self as the only oblation which God demands. St. Paul has given the phrase which describes the tumultuous life of the spirit within a man when moved by the divine, — "the groanings which cannot be uttered." Hence, every religion has had its devotees, who seek the satisfaction which the soul demands in isolation and contemplation, in the mortification and torture of the body. That which was ultimately to be highest in religion assumes at first the aspect of what is lowest, most irrational, or most repulsive. Such are the forms of monasticism in every age and country.

These three attitudes in religious history follow this order of development, — that the nature-religions come first, then follows the recognition of the relation of Deity with humanity as closer and higher than that which nature sustains, and lastly comes the effort to find the relation of God to the inner spirit of the individual man as something deeper and more important than any external revelation of the divine. These three attitudes appear as distinct and separate, each complete in itself; they have given birth to religions, which have satisfied the religious instincts of peoples and races, as though each in itself were an adequate expression of human aspiration. They not only existed in the ancient world, but they still exist in the modern world, distinct and separate, each claiming to be an adequate sphere and motive for human existence. The study of

external nature which gives birth to science, is a pursuit so absorbing and so rich in its results and achievements that all else appears as secondary or unimportant. But there is another sphere of human interest and inquiry, which, to its votaries, far surpasses in importance and its vast consequences the study of nature; and that is the study of human history, which includes not only the course of events, but the biographies of great men, in whom history seems to be impersonated. If science reveals God as manifest in nature, history reveals the Deity as the controlling will in the career of humanity as a whole, until the conviction grows of some remoter purpose of the Divine to which the whole creation moves. These spheres are so distinct and separate, that rarely or never does one arise who is equally at home in both. The scientific student who has penetrated deeply into the secrets of nature can with difficulty enter that other realm of the historian, who explores the significance of events and circumstances or gets a glimpse of the glory of man and the wonders he has wrought; while the historian may remain blind to the significance of external nature in its relations with humanity. But there is also a third attitude in the modern world which may take a double form whose aspects seem to have no relation. There is the department of literature and poetry and art, whose significance lies in the inner revelations of the contents of the human spirit, disclosed not so much in event and circumstance of history as in the motions of an inner life, whose deepest source is enveloped in the mystery of the human personality. Or in its other aspect it is the sphere of personal and individual religion, the deeper culture of the life of God in the soul of man, which gives birth to many subtle varieties and shades of religious experience. It is rare that any one preoccupied with the demands of literature, or seeking satisfaction for the questionings of the soul, can feel entirely at home in the sphere of the student of science or of human history. What they take from these departments they take on trust, appropriating as they are able, but are not competent to speak with authority. Nor does

the Christian heart, absorbed in the exercises of piety, greatly concern itself with the revelation of God in nature or in history, but often shrinks from them as if they endangered the inward communion of the soul with God.

Other illustrations may be drawn from Christian history, which reveal, as still existing and productive, that tendency in the older world to beget religions which shall stand for these distinct conceptions of the one divine revelation. In the eighteenth century what prestige and potency was attached to the so-called religion of nature, which was based on or deduced from the observation of natural order and law, at a moment when the new-born natural sciences were in the first flush of triumphant vigor. Under the influence of the religion of nature as then expounded and practised, historical Christianity was losing its meaning and value, and seemed threatened with extinction. Again, there are to-day Christian churches, and notably the Church of Rome, which in reactionary mood asserts historical Christianity as of primary importance, but subordinates the religion of nature and the personal or individual apprehension of the teaching of Christ, till they find no adequate expression within its fold, till science and free inquiry are placed under the ban, if they assert their original birthright, — the one as endangering the supernatural, the other as resting upon mere subjectivity, as it is called, with no basis or authority in the revelation of the divine. Thus the modern world is divided as was the ancient world, and yet beneath the threefold assertion of the divine activity there lurks the conviction of a deeper unity, and efforts are made not without success to assert it. It may never come to pass that those living under the influence of one of these forms of revelation will be able to do justice to all that is contained in the others; but yet against the inborn persistent tendency which not only distinguishes but separates, which constantly tempts the advocates of one phase of religion to declare that those who differ from them are worshipping a different God, there is the undying protest of the formula of the Trinity, "I believe in one God."

If the course of Christian history discloses the enduring tendency to distinguish between the revelation of the Father in creation, and in the order of the visible world, the revelation of the Son in the redemption of humanity as a process revealed in history, or the revelation of the Holy Spirit in the inward life of the individual soul, as though either of these might constitute a religion without the others, so also does the history of the church reveal the threefold consciousness and will and purpose in unity, as if no one of the three were to be excluded or subordinated to the others. These three agree in one. Beneath the diversity there is an underlying unity which, if it be not denied, still asserts its claim, and at least keeps the problem forever real. When unity is sought for by the customary methods of suppression, the higher unity is reasserted by division and schism. In the ancient church also when the effort was made to overcome the nature-religions as by the first Christian apologists, who failed, however, at the same time to do justice to the divine life as revealed in nature, the principle inherent in those old religions came back, and entering the church in unsuspected ways revolutionized its cultus. When in the ancient church there was a tendency toward the suppression of the inner personal life by external authority, when prophetism was discouraged and finally banished, there arose in monasticism a protest in behalf of the inner life of the Spirit and its coequal importance when compared with the interests of historic religion, — such a protest as the world has not witnessed before or since. Thus the conflicts of the church and its inner revolutions attest the coequality of the three distinctions in the one divine essence. Natural religion or the Fatherhood of God, historical Christianity or the worship of the Son, the inward experience wrought by the Holy Spirit, these three also agree in one. But no one of them is complete without the others.[1]

[1] Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, qui dedisti famulis tuis in confessione verae fidei aeternae Trinitatis gloriam agnoscere, et in potentia majestatis adorare Unitatem: quaesumus ut ejusdam fidei firmitate ab omnibus semper muniamur adversis (Miss. Sar., *In die Sanctae Trinitatis*).

The doctrine of the Trinity [1] differs from other Christian doctrines, in that it appears in history as the one doctrine about which the Catholic church was agreed, whose proclamation caused no schism. The definition at a later time of the Two Natures in the Person of Christ was followed by two successive schisms, the Nestorian and the Monophysite, which have never yet been overcome; but the doctrine of the Trinity ultimately triumphed without dividing the church, and the opposition to it gradually faded away. This doctrine also appears as one to whose development every part of the church contributed, — Gaul in the person of Irenæus; North Africa as represented by Tertullian; Italy by Hippolytus, Callistus, Noetus, and Dionysius; Egypt by Clement and Origen, and finally by Athanasius. The Eastern church further participated in the discussion, as in the work of Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, and Gregory of Nyssa; and in the West, there were Hosius of Cordova, Hilary of Poitiers, and Augustine. But even further: when the process was complete, it appeared that those who had been regarded as heretics had also, by insisting upon partial truths, kept before the mind of the church the diverse elements which constituted the problem to be solved, no one of which could be passed over without injury to the final solution. Thus the various forms of Ebionitism, which was the perpetuation of Judaism within the church, persisted in maintaining the worship of the Father as the one and only God, subordinating Christ till He appeared as one of the prophets, filled with

[1] Cf. the histories of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret and Evagrius; the writings of Fathers Athanasius, Hilary, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, and Augustine; Petavius, *De Trinitate;* Bull, *Defensio fidei Nicaenae;* Waterland, *Vindication of Christ's Divinity;* Liddon, *Bampton Lectures,* 1866; Coleridge, *Literary Remains* in *Works,* Vol. V. (Am. Ed.); Maurice, in *Religions of the World* and in other writings; Dorner, *Person of Christ;* Shedd, *History of Doctrine,* Vol. I.; Scott, *Origin and Development of the Nicene Theology;* Gwatkin, *History of Arianism;* Steenstra, *The Being of God, as Trinity and Unity;* Gordon, G. A., *The Trinity the Ground of Humanity;* Meier, *Geich. d. Trinitätslehre;* Baur, *Dreieinigkeitslehre;* Schultz, *Die Lehre v. d. Gottheit Christi;* Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte,* II. 183–302. See also in general the Doctrine-histories, and General Church Histories, Hefele on the Councils, Gibbon, *Decline and Fall,* etc.

the divine power beyond other men, yet not rising above the plane of humanity. But before the process was over even Ebionitism showed a tendency, as in the case of Paul of Samosata, to exalt Christ to the honors of divinity. The Gnostics, who were for the most part hostile to Judaism, inclined to place the eternal Father in the background, dwelling with supreme interest upon the Sonship of Christ in time and eternity and especially in the dispensations of human history. And again, it was the mission of the Montanist prophets to keep alive the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as the highest form of the divine revelation, and this at a moment when the devotion to Christ and to historical Christianity threatened to impair the vision of the Spirit's influence.

Again, in the early stages of its development, the doctrine of the Trinity suffered from one-sided efforts, now to maintain the unity, at the expense of distinction and diversity within the divine nature, and, on the other hand, from the tendency to magnify the distinctions so as to weaken the unity. The doctrine known as Patripassianism or Sabellianism was not without its attraction and deep inward appeal when it so identified the Father and the Son that God the Father was represented as dying upon the cross; for the world was hungering for the truth that absolute Deity was in sympathy with man and had come to his relief. But there was a deeper undercurrent of conviction, which refused to identify the eternal Son with the eternal Father; for there is another demand of the soul, calling for the assurance that in the inmost depth of the Godhead, at the source and fountain of all existence, there should be rest and peace; sympathy indeed, and participation in all that affects humanity, but without pain or suffering, — the promise and the pledge of immutable Deity that the final outcome, after all the fears and the storms of life, was endless bliss.

But the greatest obstacle to be overcome in formulating the Christian idea of God was the prevalence of the philosophical assumption, inherent in all systems of ancient thought, that what proceeded forth from God must be

inferior to God. Such was the theory of emanation, the ancient equivalent for the modern word 'evolution,' which infected the speculations of Gnostics or Neoplatonists, — that what came from God was stamped with the badge of weakness and imperfection in varying degree, so that the manifestation of life in all the grades of universal existence was forever deteriorating in its divine quality from one stage to another of imperfection, until humanity and this world were reached in the lowest stage, and most remote from Deity. It mattered not that all things shared in the divine life to some extent, so long as this depressing doctrine held sway, whose effect was to separate man from God. So long as this doctrine prevailed, no reconstruction of the religious or social order was possible. Until it had been overcome humanity was exposed to oppression and tyranny without redress. The church Fathers, Tertullian and Hippolytus, Clement and Origen, none of them quite escaped its influence, as shown in a tendency to place the Son, or the Logos which emanates from God, in subordination to the highest Deity, as if some lower God. Such, at least, was their theory, which they contradicted in practice by worshipping the Son as coequal with the Father. But these same church Fathers, as well as heathen thinkers, were also striving to escape the consequences of their thought; so that Athanasius, when he appeared, came as the climax and culmination of many efforts, the long process of the centuries. With the doctrine of the ὁμοούσιον, that the Son is "the only begotten, that is of the essence of the Father," and consubstantial with the Father, there came the final and essential abandonment of heathen principle of emanation.

Again, it was characteristic of the controversy about the relation of Christ to the Father, that while it was begun under the influence of Greek philosophy, and indeed never wholly lost its dependence upon Greek philosophical nomenclature, yet, as time went on, there was a tendency to translate the language of Greek philosophy back again into the simpler terms of common life as they were used in the Gospel narrative. Tertullian employed the term

'Son' (*υἱός*) as a substitute for the word *λόγος*, and was followed by Origen, who employed the word 'generated' instead of 'emanated.' The difficult expressions, *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος* and *λόγος προφορικός*, which embarrassed earlier thinkers, yielded to the idea of an eternal Sonship, as the correlative of eternal Fatherhood. So long as it was a question of the schools, debated only by those trained to philosophical discrimination and capable of drawing subtle distinctions, the controversy did not affect the life of the church nor disturb its peace. But a new issue arose, which was also a clear and simple one, when Arius appeared with a new teaching unheard of in the church before, that the Son was created in time and by the will of the Father, a being supernatural indeed, but inferior to the Father and of a different essence. Then was born the formula of the *ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί*, which was simple and intelligible to the popular mind, and destined to be fruitful in vast results, — the Son is coequal with the Father.[1]

II

The coming of Constantine, the alliance of the Catholic church with the Roman Empire, the rise of Arius and of Athanasius are contemporaneous events. It is probable that, in the nature of the case, even if we could not trace the internal relationship between these events, there is some deep inward connection, in the light of which their interpretation gains clearness and significance. Arianism may be regarded as a tacit understanding of the terms on which the union of church and state reposed. The

[1] For a just criticism of the Nicene theology in its formal aspects, cf. Fairbairn, *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology*, c. iv., § 5. "In contending for the Deity of the Son, it too much forgot to conceive the Deity through the Son and as the Son conceived Him. . . . The church, when it thought of the Father, thought more of the First Person in relation to the Second than of God in relation to man; when it thought of the Son, it thought more of the Second Person in relation to the First than of humanity in relation to God" (p. 91). These defects, which appear in formal controversy, tend to disappear in the worship. But they could not be fully overcome until the Third Person had revealed Himself in the inner experience of humanity in the slow courses of history.

fundamental tenet of the Arian creed may be regarded as an act of submission to the Empire; the Arian theology and its view of Christ were so far in harmony with the principle of Roman imperialism as to support the claims of the emperors to absolute authority. On the other hand, the Nicene faith, and more particularly Athanasius as its exponent, stand for resistance to the Empire, and in the last analysis of causes, it was the doctrine of the Trinity or the coequality of the Son with the Father which completed the disintegration of Roman power and resolved the Empire into its original fragments.

Constantine, it is true, gave his approval to the teaching of Athanasius, and by his authority helped to gain a nominal victory for Athanasius at the Council of Nicæa. But hardly had he done so, when he withdrew his sanction from the Nicene symbol and co-operated with the enemies of Athanasius, who were seeking to destroy his influence. Whether Constantine's acquiescence in the Nicene faith was ever more than a formal act, or whether he changed his faith and became an Arian, may be uncertain; but at least he came to believe that Athanasius was disturbing the peace of the Empire, and in this conviction he was not mistaken. In his later years, Constantine was associated in close intimacy with members of his own family who were hostile to the Nicene formula, with bishops like Eusebius of Cæsarea who disliked it, or Eusebius of Nicomedia who rejected it; and by the latter he was finally baptized in his last sickness. To his son Constantius, who became sole emperor in 350, Athanasius was a *persona non grata*, as he had been to his father. Constantius did what lay in his power to make Arianism the creed of the church. The Emperor Julian (361–363), although a heathen, indifferent toward parties in the church, could not be indifferent to Athanasius, and regarded him with aversion as a man dangerous to the peace of the Empire. The Emperor Valens in the East (364–378) became an active and bitter persecutor of the adherents of the Nicene Creed. Those bishops who dared defy the emperors in the strength of some newborn courage were men who championed the principle of

the *Homoüusion*, — Basil and the two Gregories, and in the West Ambrose, who had sat as a pupil at the feet of these Eastern teachers. The doctrine of the Trinity did not finally triumph until the new city of Constantinople rose to power and made itself felt in the counsels of the Empire. The proclamation of the doctrine of the Trinity as the true Catholic faith by Theodosius in 380 was followed, in 381, by the declaration that Constantinople was the New Rome, second only in dignity to the ancient capital of the Empire. But the rise of Constantinople was the signal for the rise of other nationalities in the East, and for Rome also in the West, and from that moment may be dated the downfall of the Roman Empire. The doctrine of the Trinity, or of the coequality of the Son with the Father, was incompatible with the spirit of empire resting on force for its sanction; it promoted individual liberty and national freedom, but it meant the ultimate destruction of an imperial despotism.

The Arian conception of Deity was identical with the thought of God upon which imperialism rests for its sanction. The God whom Arius proclaimed was not the constitutional sovereign of the universe, whose will was in harmony with truth, and goodness, and justice, as men could read those qualities in human experience, but was rather the arbitrary absolute will, unconditioned and without relationship, incomprehensible to man; a will which no insight could penetrate, which called for absolute unhesitating submission. Arianism was further in harmony with the usage of Roman imperialism, in that it deified a creature, for such was Christ in the Arian scheme, — a creature who did not share in the divine essence or nature, who did not know the God who called Him into existence, but was simply the agent for the execution of a higher will. But such was the principle of Roman imperialism also, which authorized the deification of the Roman emperors, who were sent into the world to enforce obedience to the will which sent them, and when their work was done were to be honored with a place at the banquet of the gods.[1]

[1] The teaching of Arius, as preserved by Athanasius in quotations from the writings of Arius, known as the Thalia, is as follows: "God was not

The teaching of Athanasius is comprised in one simple conviction, that in Christ God had entered into humanity. Since God was eternally the Father, there must have been an eternal Son, and this Son was coessential and coequal with the Father. There was no deification of Christ in the thought of Athanasius, for Christ shared in the divine essence with the Father. But there followed in the mind of Athanasius, as an inevitable inference from the doctrine of the incarnation, the deification of men, of that whole race of humanity which God in Christ had taken into organic relationship with Himself.

The writings of Athanasius and of the Greek Fathers who carried on his work bear witness in a striking way to the significance of the doctrine of the coequality of the Son with the Father, which had been set forth at Nicæa, as if therein were involved the principle of human freedom, in every form, whether national or individual, the eternal ground and sanction of the dignity of man. There have been other teachers who have proclaimed these truths in later days, but none has surpassed, and few have dared to rival, the exalted language in which Athanasius and his compeers proclaimed the divinity of human nature. Only at a moment of exalted enthusiasm, before the inevitable decline which overtakes all human movements, could words like those of Athanasius have been coined — "He

always a Father; once God was alone and not yet a Father, but afterwards He became a Father. The Son was not always; He was made out of nothing; once He was not; He was not before His origination; He had an origin of creation. For God was alone, and the Word as yet was not nor the Wisdom. Then wishing to form us, thereupon He made a certain one and named Him Word and Wisdom and Son that He might form us by means of Him. The Word is not the very God; though He is called God, yet He is not very God; by participation of grace, He, as others, is God only in name. The Word is alien and unlike in all things to the Father's essence and propriety. Even to the Son the Father is invisible; the Word cannot perfectly either see or know His own Father. He knows not his own essence; the essences of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost are separate in nature and estranged and disconnected and alien and without participation of each other; utterly unlike from each other in essence and glory unto infinity" (*Orat.* I., c. 2).

For the Creed of Arius, at a later time presented to Constantine, and which is reticent about the points in dispute, see Socrates, *H. E.*, i. 26; Sozomen, *H. E.*, ii. 27; Schaff, II., p. 28, and Hahn, p. 202.

was made man that we might be made God."[1] Or again, "The Word was made flesh that we, partaking of His Spirit, might be deified."[2] "For man had not been deified if joined to a creature (*i.e.* the Arian conception of Christ) or unless the Son were very God."[3] "He has become man that He might deify us in Himself."[4] "For as the Lord, putting on the body, became man, so we men are deified by the Word as being taken to Him through His flesh and henceforward inherit life everlasting."[5] This apprehension of the result of the incarnation, which Athanasius never tires of enforcing, is not limited by any principle of election, but is presented as if the consequences of the incarnation extended to all. "He first sanctified Himself that He might sanctify us all. The Spirit as a precious ointment is poured forth from Him over all humanity."[6] "The world, taken with guilt, lay under the condemnation of the law; but the Word took the judgment up into Himself, and suffering in the flesh for all He bestowed salvation upon all."[7] Or in the words of Gregory of Nyssa:

"That Deity should be born in our nature, ought not reasonably to present any strangeness to the minds of those who do not take too narrow a view of things. For who, when he takes a survey of the universe, is so simple as not to believe that there is Deity in everything, penetrating it, embracing it, and seated in it? For all things depend on Him who is. If, therefore, all things are in Him and He in all things, why are they scandalized at the plan of Revelation, when it teaches that God was born among men, that same God whom we are convinced is even now not outside mankind? For although this last form of God's presence amongst us is not the same as that former presence, still His existence amongst us equally both then and now is evidenced; only now He who holds together Nature in existence is transfused in *us*, while at that other time He was transfused throughout *our nature*, in order that our nature might by this transfusion become itself divine, rescued as it was from death, and put beyond the reach of the caprice of the antagonist. For His return from death becomes to our mortal race the commencement of our return to the immortal life."[8]

[1] *De Incar.*, § 54.
[2] *De Decretis*, c. iii. 14.
[3] *Orat.* II., *c. Ar.*, § 70.
[4] *Epis.* lx. *Ad Adeph.* 4.
[5] *Orat.* III. *c. Ar.*, § 26, § 34.
[6] *Orat.* I. *c. Ar.*, § 48.
[7] *Orat.* II. *c. Ar.* § 69, and I. § 60.
[8] *Cat. Mag.*, c. xxv.; cf. also Greg. Naz., *Epis. ad Cled.*, c. i.

So deep a conviction, expressed in language so emphatic, and shared also by the great church teachers of the age could not have existed without leaving some impression both on the church and the world. We have here the motive which strengthened Athanasius in his resistance to the Roman Emperor. He has sometimes been regarded as a theologian fighting in behalf of a dogma, which when riveted on the church limited its intellectual freedom. But his true character is that of a national hero, fighting for the liberty of simple manhood, — a man who has realized his freedom and dignity as a man by the power of the incarnation and henceforth will defy princes and the whole tyranny of the Empire, in the cause of the emancipation of his brethren. The same characteristic is seen in the other Greek Fathers, in Basil, in Gregory of Nazianzus, or Gregory of Nyssa, in Ambrose also in the West and in Chrysostom, all of whom had caught the same spirit. These men alike felt their superiority, as free men who had been redeemed in Christ, to the Roman emperors. They boldly asserted their superiority; they hesitated not to reprove the heirs of the Cæsars; they threatened them with the divine punishment for their injustice or iniquity. In this way was the doctrine of the incarnation or the coequality of the Son with the Father invalidating the power of the Roman Empire, as also the theory that the will of the Emperor was the highest and only source of authority.

From this point of view the period of fifty years which followed the Council of Nicæa reveals the meaning of the ὁμοούσιον as it cannot be revealed by theological commentaries, or by weary analysis of phrases, or argumentative terms, which the combatants in the controversy employed. It was a struggle of the Empire, in the persons of the Roman emperors, to subdue one man, who felt himself a man of God and a man in Christ, by the power of the incarnation. The heathen empire had attempted to exterminate the Christian church as an organization and had failed. The Christian empire attempted a seemingly easy task when it proposed to subdue one solitary individual man, but the result was a failure. The same task was

attempted again in the age of the Reformation, when the power of the revived Holy Roman Empire of the West was unable to compass the destruction of Luther. The analogy between these two men, and the situations which they represented, is so close as to reveal in both cases one common motive, — the freedom of the individual man, and the freedom of the state, through which individual liberty is made a real possession.

From this point of view, the deep interest of Athanasius in the cause of the rising monasticism becomes more clear. For monasticism, under its most obscure and repugnant forms, was still a movement toward individual freedom, to be accomplished by flight from the haunts and associations of despotic authority, whether political or ecclesiastical, as well as by the more immediate communion of the soul with God. The eminent champions of the Nicene faith were all of them in sympathy with the monastic principle. Basil and the Gregories made their preparation for the ministry under monastic training. Ambrose was its sturdy defender in the West, where also Athanasius endeavored to win favor for the new institution which was at first regarded with fear and dislike. The *Life of St. Antony*, which may have been written by Athanasius himself,[1] breathes the air of an emancipated manhood, through the power of the incarnation. St. Antony taught the people, it is there said, that "the Son of God was the Eternal Word and Wisdom, *of the essence of the Father*." The independent spirit of the founder of monasticism, as he is called, is brought out in the story of his relations to the Roman emperors, as if it were felt at the time that it had some special significance:

"And the fame of Antony came even unto kings. For Constantine Augustus and his sons Constantius and Constans, the Augusti, wrote letters to him, as to a father, and begged an answer from him. But

[1] *Vita S. Ant.*, c. 69. For a summary of the discussion regarding the authorship of the *Vita*, cf. Robertson, *Proleg.* to the writings of Athanasius in *Select Library of Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. IV., pp. 188 ff. Among recent writers who have pronounced in favor of the

he made nothing very much of the letters, nor did he rejoice at the messages, but was the same as he had been before the emperors wrote to him. But when they brought him the letters, he called the monks and said, 'Do not be astonished if an emperor writes to us, for he is a man; but rather wonder that God wrote the law for men, and has spoken to us through His own Son.' And so he was unwilling to receive the letters, saying that he did not know how to write an answer to such things. But being urged by the monks because the emperors were Christians, and lest they should take the ground that they had been spurned, he consented that they should be read, and wrote an answer approving them because they worshipped Christ, and giving them counsel on things pertaining to salvation; not to think much of the present, but rather to remember the judgment that is coming, and to know that Christ alone was the true and Eternal King."[1]

III

The work of Athanasius was resumed, not in Italy or in North Africa, but in Gaul. Already had Gaul been closely connected with the East by the missions which carried to it the Christian faith, and by Irenæus, who, taking up his residence there, had brought with him something of the spirit of the Eastern church. But in the fourth century, also, Gaul possessed a theologian in Hilary of Poitiers, who was at once original and profound, — capable of entering into the subtle distinctions of controversy, while yet maintaining the pre-eminence of the spiritual issues of life. Like Athanasius, he regarded the question of the one Godhead with the triune distinctions not as an ingenious problem of the speculative mind, to be solved by metaphysical reasoning, but as a practical issue involving the freedom and the elevation of humanity. With Athanasius, he recognized that the doctrine of the coequality of the Son with the Father was the inmost kernel of Christian thinking, but of even higher importance for the Christian life, because it carried with it the implication of the nobility of the human soul. He resembled Athanasius in the inferences which he drew from

Athanasian authorship are Harnack, Möller, and Eichhorn. The objections are given in Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, pp. 98 ff., and in Farrar, *Lives of the Fathers*, I., pp. 385, 386.

[1] *Vita*, c. 81.

the incarnation of God in Christ. To Hilary, the incarnation was a witness of a certain inward adaptability of the human for the union with the divine. The Eternal Son was to him the divine image in every man, the idea or pattern of every human soul. Hence the incarnation must have been part of God's eternal plan for the revelation of Himself to man. That which Christ had accomplished in Himself, the elevation of humanity into the divine essence, was also henceforth the destiny of human souls. In Christ, as Hilary taught, humanity as a whole had been reborn, and in its identification with Christ all mankind had died and risen again, to sit down hereafter with Him upon His throne. The existence of such a man in Gaul, at a critical moment in history, must have left an influence behind which could not be effaced. He went into exile at the imperial command, a living illustration of the truth which possessed him, the realization of a free manhood under the power of a great conviction.[1]

After the fall of the Empire, the new races in Western Europe are found adhering to the Arian creed in opposition to the Nicene symbol. It may seem like a contingent circumstance that they clung to Arianism, as though they could not have understood the subtle argument or the fine distinctions by which Athanasius and his disciples supported the *Homoöusion*. But it had not been by argument alone that the doctrine of the coequality of the Son with the Father had become the formula of the Catholic church, and been proclaimed as the definition of catholicity. Rather it had been a profound conviction, which argument had purified and deepened or adapted to the intellectual methods of the age, — a conviction of the true relationship of humanity with God, which the influence of Christ had

[1] For an exposition of Hilary's thought, cf. Dorner, *Person of Christ* (Eng. Trans.), Div. I., Vol. 2, pp. 399–420: "We have, in the first place, to remark in general the high estimate he formed of the nobility of the human soul. It is not of foreign substance, like the body, which is taken from the earth, but springs from God, and is a likeness of the image of God (imaginis Dei exemplum) of the First-born of the creation. By its thoughts and their infinite speed, the spirit imitates the omnipresence of God." Cf. also Smith, *The Church in Roman Gaul;* Art. *Hilary*, by Semisch, in Herzog, *Real Encyc.*, and Reinkens, *Hilar. v. Poitiers.*

implanted in the soul. The Arian formula commended itself to the new races in the West as a badge of difference and distinction, by which they might maintain their separateness and superiority over the conquered Roman population, by which also it was hoped to build up a barbarian empire in the place of the Roman on whose ruins they had trampled.[1] The Arian formula stood to the barbarian peoples of the West for the rude conviction that Deity is primarily in its essence omnipotent power and absolute will; as the same formula had also stood in the Roman world for an act of submission to the imperial will of the Roman Emperor. The purpose of the barbarians to substitute another empire, based on the power of conquest, was defeated; and in the obscure history of the time it is evident that the watchword of freedom was the Nicene faith, that until the new races had received it, they could not take the first step toward building up a permanent order or overcome the repugnance of the Catholic population, with which it was essential they should somehow become reconciled. The dark scenes in which the Ostrogothic kingdom expired in Italy indicated that there was a fatal weakness at the sources of its power which no skill or wisdom or good intentions could overcome.[2] Once more, as in the days of Athanasius, it became the supreme issue between Barbarism and Romanism, whether Christ were equal with the Father because sharing in the eternal divine essence, or were rather some supernatural delegate to declare the divine will.

It is hard to believe that rude, barbarian warriors, like Clovis, were sensible to these spiritual distinctions. But when Clovis accepted the Nicene faith, he was hailed by the bishops in Gaul as a second Constantine who had

[1] "The fact of the Arian doctrine being more easily apprehended, and hatred to the Romans, procured the confidence of the Germans in Arianism; and it soon obtained the reputation of being as generally the Christianity of the Germans as Homoöusianism of the Romans." Gieseler, *Ec. His. I.* 461.

[2] Cf. Hodgkin, *Theoderic*, in the *Heroes of the Nations* series, for the purpose to build up a monarchy which should include the peoples holding the Arian creed; also his *Italy and her Invaders*.

come to the rescue of the church. That he was instructed as to the significance of his new creed, and was aware, at least, of its social importance, is apparent from the writings of Gregory of Tours, who has preserved the reports of conversations held with the Arians. These discussions are interesting as disclosing, despite their crudity, the intensity of conviction as well as the aggressive zeal of the Catholic Christian. Thus there came to the King Chilpéric an ambassador named Agila, who, in passing through Tours, combated the doctrine of the church:

"That," said he, "was an impious statement of the ancient bishops, which declared that the Son was equal to the Father; for how could he be equal to the Father who himself affirmed, My Father is greater than I. He who does the will of another, as Christ did, is inferior to Him whose will he obeys. It is not right that he should be regarded as coequal with the Father, who called himself inferior, who bemoaned to his Father the hardness of his death, to whom at the last moment he recommended in death his spirit."[1]

We note in the discussion, as it proceeds, the negative attitude of Agila, chiefly concerned in denying that which the Catholic affirmed. Leaving out of the question the truth of the issue at stake, one is impressed with the positive richness and beauty which the Nicene doctrine, as Gregory enforced it, lends to this present world. The Arian Agila, who was no mean opponent of the Catholic bishop, is entangled and weakened by negations: "The Son was *not* equal to the Father"; "There was a time when the Son did *not* exist"; "He *only* became the Son of God from the time when he became man." Gregory was, at least, inspired to utter great positive affirmations: "The Son of God was the Wisdom of God, His light, His truth, His life, His justice; since these are essential to the Deity, God Himself could not exist without the Son; if the Son affirms inferiority, it is the expression of the grace of his humility, for he also says, "I and my Father are one"; it does not make him inferior to God that he obeys the divine will, for the Father is in the Son as the Son is in the Father; if he laments his death in prayer to his

[1] *Greg. Tur.*, V. 44.

Father, yet he also prays, "Glorify Thou Me with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was"; to which cry the Father responded: "I have already glorified Thee and will glorify Thee again." To the words of the Evangelist which Gregory quoted, the Arian made no answer: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God, — that Word which has been made flesh and has dwelt amongst us."

The argument then turns to the Holy Spirit, whom Agila affirms to be a creature inferior to the Son as well as to the Father, because it is declared that He is sent by both, and he who is sent is inferior to those who send him. But Gregory warns him of the sin of speaking against the Holy Spirit. The Son of God has come to prepare in this world of sin a place in which the Spirit of purity might dwell. Henceforth, it is He who actuates all things, giving to each one severally as He wills, and, therefore, exercising the divine function, one with the Father in kingdom and majesty and power. Agila finally withdrew from the colloquy, complaining that, at least, it was no crime to think as he did, as though Gregory had been abusing his creed. But hard and bitter words passed between them before they separated, the Arian declaring that he would die before he would accept the communion from a priest of the Catholic church; and Gregory declaring it to be profanity to dispense the sacred emblems to the dogs. But Gregory adds that, later, when Agila was enfeebled by sickness, he was converted of necessity to our religion.

Another of these archaic pictures of the new world of the sixth century, which reveals how the thought of men was moving, has been preserved by Gregory. An Arian named Ophila came from Spain, bringing presents to King Chilpéric, and who, on arriving at Tours on Easter Day, proclaimed himself, in response to Gregory's inquiry, as of the same religion. But the bishop noticed that while he came to the cathedral and assisted in the ceremonies of the sacrament of the altar, he did not partake of the sacri-

fice, and Gregory was convinced that he carried a lie in his right hand. The conversation began after dinner, when Ophila remarked in reply to Gregory's further questioning, that he believed in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit as constituting one power. "Why, then," said Gregory, "did you not commune with us?" "Because," said Ophila, "you do not respond as you ought in the Gloria; for we say with Paul the Apostle, 'Glory to the Father by the Son,' and you say, 'Glory to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Spirit.' The Son has announced the Father as He to whom glory is due: 'To the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory for ever and ever.'" Gregory, in reply, contends that the Arian formula deprives the Son of His glory, as if He could not share in the glory of His Father, because He had revealed the Father to the world. It had been necessary that God the Father should send His Son into the world in order to show forth God in person, so that they who had refused credence to patriarchs and lawgivers and prophets, should at least believe in His Son. Many, it is true, had not accepted Him; He came to His own and His own received Him not; but as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even those who believe in His name. Wherefore it is necessary to say, "Glory to God the Father who has sent His Son; Glory to God the Son who has redeemed the world by His blood; Glory to God the Holy Spirit, who sanctifieth the man who has been redeemed." To overcome the fear of Ophila, that equal glory rendered to the Son was reducing the glory due to God, Gregory appealed to the evangelical narrative where God Himself appears as glorifying the Son, in response to the petition of the Son, "Glorify Thy Son, that Thy Son also may glorify Thee."[1]

One may linger over these scenes in the early morning of Western civilization, as carrying the germ of a great future, as also indicating the character it was to assume. Men appear as living in the light of great convictions which dispel the surrounding darkness. The nomenclat-

[1] *Greg. Tur.*, VI. 41.

ure of Greek philosophy in which the discussion of the Trinity had first been clothed has here yielded to the simpler language of Scripture or of human relationships.[1] The exaltation of Christ implied the exaltation of humanity. Ignorant and brutal as were the kings of the new monarchy that was rising in the West, yet they were not incapable of seeing the difference between the Arian and the Nicene theologies.

IV

The Arian creed disappeared from Gaul, and from Western Christendom, as it had also yielded in the East, not in consequence of persecution, but from an inability to hold its own against the rising enthusiasm which waited upon the Nicene faith. While it is true that political necessity seemed to require the new rulers in the germinating nationalities of the West to accept the doctrine of the coequality of Christ with the Father as the condition of the recognition of their authority by the Roman population, yet this does not account for their devotion to the Nicene faith, which led them to go beyond the standards of the Eastern church in the effort to do honor to the name of Christ. The addition of the *filioque* to the Nicene Creed,[2] by which the Holy Ghost is declared to proceed

[1] "Hilary tells us that he heard the Nicene Creed for the first time only when he was about to go into exile, long after his baptism, and even when he had been some time a bishop. But with the guidance only of the evangelical and apostolical tradition, he had ever believed that which the *homoousion* lays down and that which the *homoiousion*, if truly understood, equally implies" (Smith, *The Church in Roman Gaul*, p. 195).

[2] Cf. Ffoulkes, *The Church's Creed and the Crown's Creed;* Mansi, XII., for the synods at which the question of the *filioque* was discussed; Art. *Creeds*, by Swainson, in *Dict. Chris. Biog.* The origin of the *filioque* is still obscure, but its formal insertion in the creed known as the Nicene coincides with the conversion of the Gothic king, Reccared, in Spain, where, at a synod held at Toledo in 589, it was approved and signed by the king and bishops present, and ordered to be recited at the Mass before the distribution of the elements. From Spain the creed thus amended passed into Gaul and into England. It was approved by Charlemagne and his bishops in 796 at the Synod of Friuli, and again at a council held in Aix-la-Chapelle in 809. Mr. Ffoulkes was right in affirming it to be the Crown's Creed instead of the Church's Creed; it was the

from the Father *and* the Son, may have its political aspects as the national banner which divided and distinguished the West from the Eastern Empire, but it also reveals the desire for a stronger assertion of the dignity of the Son by which His coequality with the Father should be more completely proclaimed, and the last seeming trace of inferiority obliterated.[1]

If this interpolation of the creed betrays the influence of national motives, so also does the hymn *Quicunque vult*, also known as the "Symbol of St. Athanasius," which condenses into rhythmic formulas the dialectic distinctions of a long and complicated theological controversy. Its exact date and also its authorship have not yet been finally determined, but the probability increases that, in its original form, it belongs to the first half of the fifth century. The suggestion of Waterland, that it was written by the bishop Hilary of Arles († 449), has recently been reasserted with a strong array of evidence.[2] Hilary was claiming for the metropolitan see of Arles an authority over all the

appropriation of the Catholic faith by the Western states in their independent national capacity. But the pope Leo III., Charlemagne's contemporary, ordered the creed to be recited at Rome in its uninterpolated form, though not denying the truth of the *filioque*.

[1] The doctrine of the Spirit's relation to the Son, as implied in the *filioque*, had already found expression in writers of the Eastern church — as in Cyril of Alexandria, and also more fully in Augustine's book on the Trinity, before it was incorporated into the creed as recited in Spain. Its interpolation may have been at first an accident, or through ignorance of the exact wording of the creed. Cf. Art. *Holy Ghost*, by Swete, H. B., in *Dict. Chris. Biog.*

[2] Cf. Burn, *The Athanasian Creed and its Early Commentaries*, 1896. The creed is divided into two parts, the first dealing with the Trinity, the second with the Incarnation. In this respect, it differs from the Apostles' and Nicene creeds, which are expansions of the baptismal formula and are divided into three parts. In determining the time of its origin, the negative considerations must have weight, that it contains no reference to the subject of the Two Wills in Christ, which was defined at the Sixth General Council in 680, nor to the Adoptionist controversy in Spain from 785; from which it must be inferred that it was written, as Caspari has maintained, before the seventh century. While the early history of the creed is in some respects still uncertain, it is probable that it underwent changes by addition, till it was known in its present form in the eighth century when it assumed a greater importance than in the earlier period of its formation, in consequence of political motives; yet it is evident that theological as well as political motives are connected with

churches of Gaul, the anticipation, as it were, of a national patriarchate, and was defying the claims of the bishop Leo the Great of Rome to any control in his jurisdiction. He was also quite competent to have written the creed, in virtue of his careful education as well as of his known theological attitude. He was connected, as was Vincentius, his contemporary, with the monastery of Lerins, and Vincentius quoted from the creed, as it then existed, passages which it still retains. The well-known attitude of Vincentius toward the Augustinian theology, as having no place in the Catholic faith, is reflected in the pointed language of the opening clauses of the Athanasian Creed, which is twice repeated afterward, to the effect that the Catholic faith is identical with the doctrine of the Trinity, from which the inference of Vincentius follows that speculations about the fall and original sin and predestination are novelties which have no vital relationship to human salvation, or the well-being of the Catholic church.[1] From

its origin. It is suggestive that the ancient Roman Creed should have had its adherents in Gaul at this time when it was no longer recited at Rome, and that its final expansion into its present form as the Apostles' Creed should have been made in Gaul and not in Rome. The Athanasian Creed resembles the enlarged Roman Creed in its incorporation of the phrase, "He descended into hell," but in place of the familiar formula of the Roman Creed, "Conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary," is substituted, "God of the Substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds; and Man of the Substance of His Mother, born into the world." The creed closes with what may be regarded as a qualification or explanation: it is not the acceptance of dogma which determines salvation, but the character of the life: "They that have done good shall go into life everlasting and they that have done evil into everlasting fire." It is possible that the Athanasian Creed, even in its own home in Gaul was misliked on account of its numerous and subtle distinctions and its reminders of controversy, and that for this reason the ancient Roman symbol was again revived and enlarged in order to overcome its use. The revival of the Roman symbol may have also its ecclesiastical significance, as a bond of unity with the Roman church. Cf. Art. *Quicunque* in *Dict. Chris. Biog.*; Ommany, *The Early History of the Athanasian Creed*; Lumby, *His. of the Creeds.*

[1] In one of its clauses also the Athanasian Creed records a protest against the rising tendency in Greek and Latin Christianity alike, as shown in the sacrament of the altar, to reconvert Christ into the flesh and to worship the body. Of the Person of Christ it is here said that He is one Christ, although He be God and man, "*One; not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh; but by taking of the Manhood into God.*"

this point of view the Athanasian Creed, in its original form, may have been not only the symbol of a national aspiration, but may also be regarded as a protest in behalf of simplicity, the creed, as it has been called, of a liberal Christianity in that distant age.

To the modern mind, construing this creed as a formal document, its historical associations have become obscured, till it no longer interprets a vast spiritual movement, in which modern society, civil as well as religious, was taking its rise. Not only is its terminology misleading, in consequence of the changes which time has wrought in the significance of the Latin word *persona*,[1] but as a creed, when it is regarded as such, its opening statement seems impossible and irrational if not inhuman, — "Whosoever will be saved; before all things it is necessary, that he hold the Catholic Faith; which Faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly"; or its concluding statement, — "This is the Catholic Faith, which except a man believe faithfully he cannot be saved." But these words assume another and a different meaning, when, no longer interpreted apart from their historical associations, they are listened to as a voice from the inmost being of an age and a people who were in mortal combat with enemies whose triumph would have been fatal to human progress and freedom. So, at least, it seemed then, and there is reason for believing that the fear was based on real grounds. We must judge of what might have been from that which has

[1] The word *persona*, as used in the Athanasian Creed, carried at first the meaning of function or office, nearly equivalent to the Greek *πρόσωπον*. Thus in early English it became *parson*. But the modern English *person* is equivalent to an individual, and thus is very remote from the original Latin *persona*, and its use in the creed accounts in some measure for the popular tritheistic view of the Deity. Upon this word *person*, as thus used, Canon Liddon has remarked in his *Bampton Lectures:* "In the common language of the Western church, these distinct forms of being (in the Divine Essence) are named Persons. Yet that term cannot be employed to denote them without considerable intellectual caution" (p. 32). If the word *person*, as used in this creed, may be taken as the equivalent of personality, which is something larger than mere individuality, it would not inadequately represent the force of the Greek *ὑπόστασις* as understood by the Greek Fathers of the fourth century.

been. The Nicene faith prevailed and so has a Christian civilization, which has moved steadily forward, despite great obstacles, into the light and the liberty of the children of God. Not only against Arianism, which denied that God had taken humanity by the power of the incarnation into close organic relation with Deity, was the Catholic church contending, but in this same period, it was girding itself for the final conflict with Islam, which, if it had prevailed in Western Europe, would have destroyed the fairest prospect in the world's history. Living in the consciousness of these dangers, a creed may become something more than a theological formula, it may be a banner, a war-song or a triumphal hymn. In its glorification of Christ as the son of God and coequal with the Father, whom truly to know is life eternal, a creed like this becomes the expression of the Christian heart in opposition to the Mohammedan formula, — "Far be it from God that he should have a son." The rise of the Athanasian creed into confessional importance coincides with the age of the Saracen invasion of Gaul, and with the great victory on the plains between Tours and Poitiers in 732, when the Mohammedans were driven back and Christian Europe was saved from the great calamity which threatened it. The analogies, therefore, of the *Quicunque vult* are to be found, not in the Apostles' or the Nicene Creed, so much as in the song of Miriam on the crossing of the Red Sea, or the hymn of Deborah on the conquest of the foes of a chosen people, or the war-cry of the ancient psalmist: "Let God arise and let His enemies be scattered; let them that hate Him, flee before Him." It was in this spirit that the so-called "Symbol of St. Athanasius" became the emblem of hope and deliverance.[1]

[1] The late Mr. Maurice (F. D.) was an ardent advocate of the Athanasian Creed, although thinking its recital unwise, in view of the prevailing dislike to what are called its "damnatory clauses." He maintained that these clauses were capable of a truer interpretation: "The name of the Trinity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, is, as the fathers and schoolmen said continually, the name of the Infinite Charity, the perfect Love, the full vision of which is that beatific vision for which saints and angels long even while they dwell in it. To lose this, to be separated

There is nothing in the history of the Middle Ages to indicate that the motive was ever reversed or overcome, whose influence first became apparent when the Nicene symbol was accepted as the social contract for the adjustment of relations between the Christian church and the civil order. When the Roman Empire accepted the Nicene faith, its dissolution, as empire based upon force, began, and the formative process also appeared which tended toward nationality as its ultimate goal. The revival of ancient sentiment under the form of the Holy Roman Empire was confined in its influence chiefly to Germany and to Italy,

from this, to be cut off from the Name in which we live and move and have our being, is everlasting death. . . . But who incur this separation? I know not. You and I, while we are repeating the creed, may be incurring it. The Unitarian may be much nearer the Kingdom of Heaven than we are. He may in very deed less divide the substance, less confound the persons, than we do. For I feel myself that when I fall into an unchristian, heartless condition, I do divide the substance, I do confound the persons inevitably, even though I may be arguing ingeniously and triumphantly for the terms that denote distinction and union" (*Life and Letters*, Vol. II., p. 413).

QUICUNQUE VULT

Whosoever will be saved: before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith. Which Faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled: without doubt he shall perish everlastingly. And the Catholic Faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity; neither confounding the Persons: nor dividing the Substance. For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son: and another of the Holy Ghost. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one: the glory equal, the majesty co-eternal. Such as the Father is, such is the Son: and such is the Holy Ghost. The Father uncreate, the Son uncreate: and the Holy Ghost uncreate. The Father incomprehensible, the Son incomprehensible: and the Holy Ghost incomprehensible. The Father eternal, the Son eternal: and the Holy Ghost eternal. And yet they are not three eternals: but one eternal. As also there are three incomprehensibles, nor three uncreated: but one uncreated and one incomprehensible. So likewise the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty: and the Holy Ghost Almighty. And yet they are not three Almighties: but one Almighty. So the Father is God, the Son is God: and the Holy Ghost is God. And yet they are not three Gods: but one God. So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son Lord: and the Holy Ghost Lord. And yet not three Lords but one Lord. For like as we are compelled by the Christian verity: to acknowledge

and it was also accompanied in the divine providence by the rise of the papacy, which became its mortal antagonist and strove, not unsuccessfully, to neutralize its power. The papacy stood for law as the larger environment within which liberty must make its home. When the modern states arose at the Reformation, the papacy fell, but the larger freedom of humanity was still co-ordinated with law, that law of national life which had its origin and guarantee in the consciousness of a free people. If religious and civil liberty seemed to have been retarded in their growth in that ancient Gaul whose national represen-

every Person by himself to be God and Lord; so we are forbidden by the Catholic religion: to say, There be three Gods or three Lords. The Father is made of none: neither created nor begotten. The Son is of the Father alone: not made, nor created, but begotten. The Holy Ghost is of the Father and the Son: neither made, nor created, but proceeding. So there is one Father, not three Fathers; one Son, not three Sons: one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts. And in this Trinity none is afore, or after other: none is greater, or less than another; But the whole three persons are co-eternal together: and co-equal. So that in all things, as is aforesaid: the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity is to be worshipped. He therefore that will be saved: must thus think of the Trinity.

Furthermore, it is necessary to everlasting salvation: that he also believe rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. For the right Faith is, that we believe and confess: that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man; God, of the Substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds: and Man, of the Substance of his Mother, born into the world; Perfect God and perfect Man: of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting; Equal to the Father as touching his Godhead: and inferior to the Father, as touching his Manhood. Who although he be God and Man: yet is he not two, but one Christ; One; not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh: but by taking of the Manhood into God; One altogether; not by confusion of Substance: but by unity of Person. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man: so God and Man is one Christ; who suffered for our salvation: descended into hell, rose again the third day from the dead. He ascended into heaven, he sitteth on the right hand of the Father, God Almighty: from whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies: and shall give account for their own works. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting: and they that have done evil into everlasting fire. This is the Catholic Faith: which except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved.

tatives, Hilary of Poitiers, Hilary of Arles, and Gregory of Tours, gave promise of its first arriving at its goal, yet it was France which struck the first blow at papal supremacy, offering the first illustration to Europe of national unity and independence. And if, afterwards, France was inwardly hurt by the selfish alliance with the papacy, or misled, as in the age of the Reformation, from her true purpose by dreams of aggrandizement and of empire, yet this was only a delay and not a defeat of the national purpose. The postponement only made the moment more awful, when at last the nation was driven to achieve by force what its kings in union with the hierarchy had attempted to stifle or suppress. The calamities and horrors of the French Revolution were the price which the nation was called upon to pay for the privilege of writing upon its portals the national motto,—Liberty, equality, and fraternity.

V

In the age of the Reformation the various churches put forth Catechisms and Confessions of Faith which, while supplementing the Catholic creeds, were not intended to disown or supersede them. These Confessions or Articles of Religion are to a great extent occupied with the statement and elaboration of convictions which the Catholic creeds do not express. There had grown up from the time of Augustine, and under the influence of his teaching, a conception of man and of his relation to God, and also, at a later time, a doctrine of atonement, which, while revealing deep motives in human experience, yet found no corresponding expression in the ancient Catholic church which gave birth to the creeds. The comparative study of these Confessions of Faith has dwelt so long upon their teaching in reference to these later theological tenets, that one important feature has been overlooked which is a common characteristic,—that they unite in affirming the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, as handed down in the Catholic creeds. The Reformers, whether in Germany, in England, or Switzerland, not only had no intention of leaving the fold of the Catholic church,

or any misgivings that they had done so, but they had the distinct purpose of remaining within it, and of pleading their cause on the basis of their retention of pure and genuine Catholicity. Indeed it was because they still held the Catholic faith, that it was possible to gain the support of kings and princes as it was also impossible that the Latin church should treat with them on any other basis than that they were still within the pale of Catholicism.

In order to understand the relation of the Reformers to the Catholic church, we must revert to that early period, when by heathens and Christians alike the Roman Empire was believed to be eternal. Within that Empire the church had arisen, at first in conflict with it and then embracing, transforming, and renewing it. When Constantine made his alliance with the Catholic church, no terms of treaty or agreement were formally acknowledged; the two powers came together in friendly relationship, the church ministering to the state, and the state protecting the church. But hardly had the alliance been made when the Arian controversy arose which shook the Empire and the church to their foundations. The immediate result of the controversy was to place the Empire, in the persons of its emperors, for nearly two generations in hostility to Athanasius and the Nicene formula. Those years constitute the crisis of the Empire, the period of its revolution and transformation, until it came to rest for its authority and permanence, its inward unity and peace, upon a Christian principle. And that principle was given in the Nicene symbol, — the coequality of the Son with the Father. This was the social compact, as it may be called, which defined the basis and rights of Christian society; and on this basis the church entered upon its formal alliance with the state, while the Empire in turn became Christian or was only another aspect of the Catholic church.

The social compact by which the Roman Empire consented to become a Christian empire, resting upon the Nicene faith as the primary canon of civil as well as of ecclesiastical law, was promulgated by the three emperors, Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius, in the year 380.

According to this decree, the Nicene doctrine of the coequality of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost is declared to be the Catholic faith. Those who accept this faith are alone to enjoy the privilege of being known as Catholics.[1] Henceforth the term 'Catholic' was no question of personal or private interpretation. Efforts to appropriate this renowned historical designation in the interest of some restricted view of the church, whether of its usage or its organization, whether in ancient days or in our own, have no value and certainly no prestige compared with the definition which gave a new foundation for Christian society. The doctrine of the Trinity was ratified by succeeding emperors, and particularly by Justinian, with whose sanction it was incorporated in the Justinian Codex, as it stood already in the Code of Theodosius, taking the precedence of all other laws or decretals.[2]

This definition of Catholicity was further ratified by popular sentiment as well as by Christian conviction. When the barbarians overran the Empire, they were powerless to build up states within its fold until they had accepted the Catholic formula. The difference between Barbarie and Romanie was reduced to one single point, — whether or not the Son was consubstantial with the Father. It was an open question with the leaders of the new races, whether to overthrow the Empire or to build within it upon its old foundations. When it was finally decided that they should

[1] Imppp. Gratianus, Valentinianus et Theodosius AAA. ad populum urbis Constantinopolitanae.

Cunctos populos quos clementiae nostrae regit imperium, in tali volumus religione versari, quam divinum Petrum Apostolum tradidisse Romanis, religio usque nunc adhuc ab ipso insinuata declarat quamque pontificem Damasum sequi claret, et Petrum Alexandriae episcoporum, virum apostolicae sanctitatis, hoc est, ut secundum apostolicam disciplinam evangelicamque doctrinam patris et filii et spiritus sancti, unam deitatem sub pari maiestate, et sub pia trinitate credamus. Hanc legem sequentes Christianorum Catholicorum nomen iubemus amplecti, reliquos vero dementes vesanosque iudicantes, haeretici dogmatis infamiam sustinere, divina primum vindicta, post etiam motus animi nostri, quem ex caelesti arbitrio sumpserimus, ultione plectendos.

D. III K. Mart. Thessalonica Gratiano V. et Theodosio AA. conss. a. 380.

[2] *Codex Justin.*, I., c. 1: *De summa Trinitate et de fide Catholica.*

remain and accomplish their work within, they accepted the social compact as enjoined by Roman law, and in accepting the doctrine of the Trinity were reconciled and fused with the Roman population. The Athanasian Creed, so-called, still retains a deep historical interest, because of its identification of the Catholic faith with the doctrine of Nicæa. In the later Middle Ages there had been set forth another definiton of catholicity, as in the so-called *Dictatus Hildebrandini*, — that it consisted in union with the Roman church. That definition played its part for a while, but when the study of Roman law was revived from the thirteenth century, every student was confronted with the older definition of catholicity as embodied in the Theodosian and Justinian codes, and the way was thenceforth open to renounce the papacy without breaking the continuity of the Catholic church.

The Reformers were keenly alive to the importance of abiding by this social compact, on which the Empire and the church alike rested for their authority. To have rejected it would have made them social outlaws. Princes could protect them, as still within the Catholic church, so long as they held by this definition of catholicity; for kings and princes also went back to Roman law, and no longer to the papacy, for the sanction of their own authority and the justification of their procedure. The Roman law, which nowhere recognized the papacy, but did recognize the Catholic church, thus became a lever for the removal of abuses and a warrant for reform. The evidence that the Reformers were aware of their stronghold, in this definition of catholicity, and were conscious that they still formed a constituent part of the Catholic church despite their rejection of Mediæval usages, is shown in the unanimity of their action in placing the doctrine of the Trinity in the foreground of their Confessions of Faith. Thus in the Augsburg Confession, the earliest of Protestant compendiums of belief, the first Article of the *Chief Articles of Faith*, relates to the Trinity:

"The churches with common consent among us do teach that the decree of the Nicene Synod concerning the unity of the divine essence

and of the three persons is true and without doubt to be believed: to wit, that there is one divine essence which is called and is God, eternal, without body, indivisible (without parts), of infinite power, wisdom, goodness, the Creator and Preserver of all things visible and invisible; and that yet there are three persons of the same essence and power, who also are coeternal, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. And they use the name of person in that signification, in which the ecclesiastical writers (the Fathers) have used it in this cause, to signify not a part or quality in another, but that which properly subsists."

The Thirty-nine Articles of Religion of the Church of England also begin with a statement entitled, "Of Faith in the Holy Trinity":

"There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts, or passions; of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, the Maker and Preserver of all things both visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there be three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost."

The *Institutes* of Calvin takes the form of a commentary upon the Apostles' and Nicene creeds, which leads him in the early chapters of his work to a discussion of the doctrine of the Trinity. The object of his argument is to show that the doctrine has the warrant of Scripture, but he was not averse to accepting the terminology of the ancient Catholic church, but defended the speculative language in which the doctrine had been defined, as only another form of expression for the teaching of the New Testament.[1] But in making Scripture the final authority for the doctrine of the Catholic creeds, Calvin did not stand alone. It is declared in the Thirty-nine Articles that these creeds are to be "received and believed because they have the most sure warrant of Holy Scripture." Such also was the conviction of Luther and Melanchthon, nor was any voice raised among the Reformers in behalf of the authority of tradition or the infallibility of general

[1] *Instit.*, I., c. 13, § 5. After calling attention to the difficulty of interpreting the terminology of the Fathers and their variations of statement, he remarks: "The modesty of these holy men should be an admonition to us, not instantly to dip our pen in gall and sternly denounce those who may be unwilling to swear to the terms which we have devised." And again: "Say, that there is a Trinity of Persons in one Divine essence, you will only express in one word what the Scriptures say."

councils as the sole ground on which the doctrine of the Trinity rested for its support. Yet there is evidence that on this point none of them were indifferent to the value of the tradition, but felt additional confidence in the strength of their attitude in consequence. In holding to the tradition of the universal Christian society which was the Catholic church or the Holy Roman Empire, their position was secure against all their foes.

This point is of peculiar importance as showing that in every country where the Reformation prevailed, there was an unbroken consciousness of unity with the Catholic church, when catholicity was taken in its authoritative interpretation, as it had come down through the ages. There was no sense of innovation as if new churches or new forms of Christian society were to be established. There was no revolution in the fundamental constitution of the Catholic church, whatever might be the changes of external form, so long as the ancient charter of catholicity was preserved which defined the Catholic faith as identified with the Nicene doctrine of the coequality of the Son with the Father. It is this underlying consciousness which explains some features of the age, which would otherwise be inexplicable — some of which also must be mentioned only to be condemned. When Cranmer drew up the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, which was intended to take the place of the Roman Canon Law, it was plainly modelled after the *Codex Justinianus*, as, for example, in the common title of the first book, *De Summa Trinitate et Fide Catholica*, which was followed by the command of the king to all his subjects, to accept the Christian faith as identified with the doctrine of the Trinity.[1] In the

[1] Cf. c. 16, EPILOGUS: "Caeterum quoniam perlongum esset, et plane opus valde laboriosum, omnia nunc distincte scribere quae Catholica fide sunt credenda, sufficere judicamus quae breviter de summa Trinitate, de Jesu Christo Domino nostro, et de salute per eum humano generi parta diximus."

C. 17: "*Pereunt qui Catholicae fidei adversantur vel ab ea deficiunt.* Hoc ipsum tamen silentio praeterire non possumus, eos omnes misere perire qui orthodoxam Catholicamque fidem amplexi nolunt; et longe gravius eos esse damnandos qui ab ea semel agnita et suscepta defecerunt." Cf. ed. Cardwell, Oxford, 1850.

preface to the Second Helvetic Confession, written by Bullinger in 1596, the most elaborate of the Swiss Confessions, the imperial edict of Theodosius,[1] is quoted in full, a challenge, as it were, to the Roman church and the Council of Trent, that the Swiss church stood upon the basis of genuine catholicity according to its only authoritative exposition.[2] To the same effect is the language of Luther himself in his preface to a treatise on the Three Creeds: "I have *ex abundanti* caused to be published together in German the three symbols or Confessions which have hitherto been held throughout the whole church; by this I testify once for all that I adhere to the true Christian church which up till now has maintained those symbols."[3]

It was this attitude of the Reformers toward Catholic tradition which led them carefully and anxiously to discriminate their movement from sectarians as they were called and particularly from Anabaptists, who broke with the principle of Catholic society by their denial of the doctrine of the Trinity. That the Anabaptists were a common terror to all the Reformers is shown by their emphatic condemnation in the various Protestant Confessions

[1] See *ante*, p. 328.

[2] Cf. Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, II., p. 235.

[3] *Die drei Symbola*, in Walch, X., p. 1198; also cited in Ritschl, *Die christl. Lehre d. Rechtfertigung u. Versöhnung* (Eng. Trans., p. 130); which also contains a valuable discussion of the relation of the Reformers to the Catholic church. "It must at once be admitted," says Ritschl, "that the Reformers themselves hardly ever expressed a clear consciousness of the fact that, by their recognition of the doctrine of the Trinity, they were holding the legal standing-ground given them by the Roman Empire. They only knew that in virtue of this confession they were maintaining the ground of the Catholic church. Neither can it be doubted that the said doctrine was originally accepted by the Reformers in virtue of church tradition, and not in virtue of the specific authority of Scripture. It was their constantly widening separation from the Roman church that first made it necessary for them to base this doctrine on Scripture, as soon as its defence (chiefly on account of Michael Servetus' denial) came to be a work of special importance to them." See also Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, III., pp. 720 ff. and 735 ff., for Luther's relation to Catholicity. "Luther rechnete sich und sein Unternehmen stets in die eine Kirche, die er allein kannte, in die katholische Kirche (wie er sie verstand) ein. Er behauptete, dass diese Kirche ihm den Rechtstitel zur Reformation selbst gebe" (III., p. 735).

of Faith.[1] But there was a melancholy story connected with this determination to adhere to the Catholic faith which cannot be forgotten, which may be explained while it cannot be palliated, — the burning of Servetus for his denial of the doctrine of the Trinity. This much at least may be said, as throwing light upon the tragedy, that Servetus, in an age when as yet religious tolerance was unknown, when the Reformers were united as one man in clinging to Catholic truth as the only possible basis for a Christian society, the one condition which made a reformation possible; Servetus appeared to be recklessly endangering not only the prospects of the Reformation but the foundation of Christian as well as of social order. Only some such extraordinary conviction can explain the approval which Melanchthon and others lent to an act which has never since ceased to be a cause for mourning and repentance. But whatever may be said of Calvin's personal attitude in this transaction, it must be admitted that the other Reformers were not moved by sinister or hypocritical motives or by blind and timid conservatism when they upheld the Catholic tradition against what seemed to them like the hand of anarchy raised to destroy the social fabric.[2]

[1] The second of the Thirty-nine Articles of the English church was influenced by opposition to Anabaptist negations. Cf. Hardwick, *His. of the Articles*, pp. 88, 96; also Augsburg Confession, Arts. I., IX.; Calvin, *Instit.* I., c. 13, §§ 22, 23.

[2] Cf. Willis, *Servetus and Calvin;* Dardier, *Michael Servet d'après ses plus récents biographes;* and for a summary of the case, Trechsel, Art. *Servetus*, in Herzog, *R. E.*, with literature.

CHAPTER III

THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MIRACLE

THE Catholic church, from the second century to the age of the Reformation, laid the greater stress upon the revelation of the Son, and although it struggled to maintain its hold upon the revelation in outward nature and in the human spirit, it was successful only in varying and imperfect measure. A glance at the external form of the Catholic creeds reveals the situation as in a picture. In the expansion and amplification of the divine name, the fullest treatment is accorded to the Son. Of the Father, it is predicated that He is the "maker of heaven and earth," to which was added later "and of all things visible and invisible." Concerning the Holy Spirit nothing was directly affirmed in the Apostles' Creed, and the original creed of Nicæa ended with the words, "I believe in the Holy Ghost." In the course of the fourth and fifth centuries, during which there were deep searchings of heart as to the office and work of the Spirit, the clauses came to be added which defined the working of the Spirit: "The Lord and the Giver of Life, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and the Son is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the prophets." The greater fulness of assertion in regard to the Son, in all the creeds alike, corresponds with the stress which was laid upon His peculiar work, whether in the Eastern or the Western church, whether in organization or doctrinal controversy, or in worship and cultus. This is what is sometimes called historical Christianity, to which is still accorded a certain pre-eminence of authority in the Greek and Latin churches, as though the Protestant development of doctrine, life, or worship were a departure from the normal standard of catholicity.

In this attitude of these ancient churches there is still preserved, it is true, an element which the modern churches have not preserved with equal force. The Sonship of Christ stands for human redemption, for human history, for the development of man, and for the solidarity of the race, in the power of the incarnation. Human history practically begins with the coming of Christ, from whose entrance into the world and into humanity, it is fitting that time should be dated in the Christian centuries. The interest of the Middle Ages lies in history, as it centres in humanity in itself, not in its relation with nature, or in the evolution of human thought. Philosophy passes lightly over the long period from the time when Greek philosophy came to an end, until its revival with the coming of Descartes. The study of nature was neglected from the time when Neoplatonism arose in the third century, with its exclusive interest in man, until it was resumed in feeble and sometimes grotesque ways in the age which preceded the Reformation.

In assigning importance to the miracle, the Catholic creeds were reflecting the impression which the life of Christ had made upon His first disciples. The evangelical narratives, in this respect, are in harmony with the creeds, abounding as they do in every page with the wonderful works of Christ: His supernatural birth, His power over disease, His command of natural law, and His final conquest over death. The Gospel is presented as having its birth in miracle and its whole environment in a miraculous atmosphere.[1] Hence a peculiar interest attaches to the Roman symbol, afterwards to be known as the Apostles' Creed, that without apology or explanation it inserted the miracle in the life of Christ as a constituent part of the Christian revelation. It was otherwise in the Eastern church, where, as in the rule of faith given by Ignatius or the comment of Origen on the Roman symbol, the introduction

[1] In this respect, an analogy is seen in Jewish history, where the era of prophecy is introduced with miracle, which also marks the rise of Judaism to its greatest height as a divine revelation, as well as the source of its influence in the moral and spiritual life of man.

of the miracle is made subordinate to a theological motive, the endeavor to overcome the ultra-spiritualism of Gnostic teachers, who denied that Christ possessed a human body. Hence, as with Ignatius, the epithet *truly*, which qualifies every miraculous affirmation, — Christ was *truly* born, *truly* suffered, *truly* died, and *truly* rose from the dead. But the Roman creed has no qualification, as if the Gnostic dream had not been heard of, or were not worth noticing, — "He was conceived by the Holy Ghost; born of the Virgin Mary; suffered under Pontius Pilate; was crucified, dead, and buried; on the third day rose again, and ascended into the heavens."

In the creeds of the Eastern church the same importance was not at first attached to the miracle as such, but rather was it subordinated to theological or other issues. The creed of Gregory Thaumaturgus makes no allusion to the miracle. In the creed of Cæsarea, in the early creed of Jerusalem, in the creed of Nicæa, the miracles mentioned are the resurrection and the ascension. The Eastern church reflected the Oriental feeling towards nature, and interpreted the miracle in its own way, according to its peculiar bias. Its relation to nature has been closer and more sympathetic than in the West, where Roman influence prevailed, whose object was to subdue men to law and government, rather than to cultivate the harmony between man and his external physical environment. But in the fifth century the Eastern and the Western creeds coalesced; what was distinctive in the Roman symbol was adopted into the creed which became known as the Nicene; and this creed, in turn, was received in Rome and throughout the West.[1]

[1] For opinion in regard to the miracle in the ancient church, cf. Origen, *Contra Celsum*, who subordinates its value as testimony, to the evidence of the Spirit, treating the miracles as symbols or allegories of a higher truth, and regarding the words of Christ as having been fulfilled in the moral miracle, — *the disciples of Christ have done greater miracles than their Master.* On the whole, it cannot be said that Origen magnified the miracle. Cf. Patrick, *The Apology of Origen*, pp. 309 ff. and 321, and Bigg, *Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, p. 263. For a view of a similar kind, cf. Athanasius, *De Incar.* (c. 29). Augustine looked at the miracle more distinctly as an expression of the divine will, and saw in the creation

It is difficult if not impossible to define the miracle, because it stands for the mystery of human existence. Its manifestation is on the border land where humanity is seen in its twofold relationship, involved on the one hand in the fortunes of physical nature and on the other revealed in its exaltation as sharing in the life of the Son of God. Hence, the miracle cannot be defined in terms of the physical life alone, nor can it be defended wholly by evidence which appeals to the senses. There is a point of view from which it may still be said that no amount of testimony can prove a miracle. Faith must here be conjoined with the evidence of the senses.[1]

The miracles of Christ are represented as calling for faith in Him before they can be wrought. Hence, it is said of a certain place which He visited, that "He could do there no mighty works because of their unbelief."

an act analogous to the miracle, which indeed became the supreme miracle, the prophecy and justification of later miracles. Cf. *De Civ. Dei*, X. 12; XXI. 6, 7, 8. Anselm finds the possibility of the miracle like Augustine in the creation, as the free act of the divine will. Cf. *De Concept. Virg.*, c. 11. Aquinas distinguished between the real miracle and the wonder, or the subjective estimate of miracles. His definition of a miracle may stand for the later Mediæval opinion: "Dicendum, quod miraculum proprie dicitur, cum aliquid fit praeter ordinem naturae; sed non sufficit ad notionem miraculi, si aliquid fiat praeter ordinem naturae alicujus particularis, quia sic, cum aliquis projicit lapidem sursum, miraculum faceret, cum hoc sit praeter ordinem naturae lapidis. Ex hoc ergo aliquid dicitur esse miraculum, quod fit praeter ordinem totius naturae creatae; hoc autem non potest facere nisi Deus, quia quidquid facit angelus vel quaecunque alia creatura propria virtute, hoc fit secundum ordinem naturae, et sic non est miraculum. Unde relinquitur, quod solus Deus miraculum facere possit" (*Pars* i., Q. 110, art. 4).

[1] "The essential question of miracles stands quite apart from any consideration of testimony" (Powell, *Study of Evidence*, p. 141); and again, the acceptance of the miracle depends upon "a religious principle of faith, and not an assent of the understanding to external evidence" (Powell, *Order of Nature*, p. 367).

"Die Ueberzeugung dass ein Wunder geschehen sei, bzw. dass man ein Wunder erlebt habe, ist eine freie, religiöse und gegenüber aller wissenschaftlichen Exörterung gleichgültige. Sie ist auch bei andern nicht durch Demonstrationen und Experimente, sondern nur durch den Einfluss der persönlichen Autorität und der eigenen Frommigkeit und Ueberzeugungskraft hervorzurufen. Ohne religiöse Motive und religiösen Sinn ist sie überhaupt sinnlos oder nackter Aberglaube" (Bornemann, *Unterricht in Christentum*, p. 129).

When Jesus walked on the sea and Peter, attempting to follow, began to sink, he was rebuked by Jesus: "O thou of little faith." To the Syro-Phenician woman, the words are: "Great is thy faith; be it unto thee even as thou wilt." Or, again, in the case of the young man possessed by an evil spirit, Jesus reproaches his disciples for not giving relief: "O faithless and perverse generation"; and when the disciples asked for the cause of their failure, the answer was: "Because of your unbelief; for if ye have faith, ye shall say to this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place, and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you" (Matt. xvii. 20). The instance of the feeding of the multitude is prefaced with the same accusation: "O ye of little faith, why reason ye among yourselves, because ye have no bread?" (Matt. xvi. 8). Not as wonders appealing to the sense of the marvellous, do the miracles possess their deepest significance: "A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given unto it."

The evidence for the miracle of the resurrection of Christ must be sought in the faith of the disciples, and in their testimony so far as it is an evidence of their faith; otherwise, the witness, which they allege, is marked by variation or contradiction, such as always waits upon human testimony. The highest evidence for the miracle is found in a certain conviction perpetuated within the church, which, as a living institution, becomes the heir of spiritual influences and bears testimony as no eye-witness can do. Such faith is seen in the process of its quickening transition, in the rule of faith given by St. Paul: "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died according to the Scriptures, and rose again on the third day according to the Scriptures." From this point of view, the revolution, for it was nothing less, is explained and justified by which the Jewish Sabbath was subordinated to the Lord's Day or the Christian Sunday, whose weekly recurrence becomes a standing monument, witnessing to some objective fact in human experience. The Easter festival, whose annual commemora-

tion is almost coeval with the birth of the church, becomes another monumental evidence to the mysterious event in which the Gospel had its rise, a strong supplementary evidence to the victory over the doubt of Thomas, or the appeal of the empty sepulchre; for in these festivals is deposited the faith of humanity. Without that faith, they would long ago have vanished as a dream.[1]

While, then, it is difficult to define the miracle, and while the evidence which substantiates it is not of a kind which demonstrates its actuality to the cool inquirer seeking for scientific proof, yet we may approximate a true conception of the miracle by studying its place in history and the function it has subserved. It was one primary result of the miracle that in the ancient church it helped to disentangle Deity from the outer world with which, in pantheistic fashion, He was identified or confused. The miracle revealed God as above nature and distinct from

[1] That faith is essential to the recognition of the miracle does not imply that inquiry into the evidence for every miracle or alleged miracle should be discouraged in the interest of faith. On the contrary, the closest scrutiny and the most careful weighing of evidence should be welcomed. Credulity and the superstition which the unthinking acceptance of the miracle has begotten are evils to be deplored. The one miracle on which the attention must be concentred is the resurrection of Christ, partly because of its transcendent interest, partly because the evidence is more abundant. For the negative criticism on the resurrection, consult Martineau, *The Seat of Authority in Religion*, who fails, however, to trace the evidence in the experience or organization of the church. See also Baur, *Kirchengeschichte der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, p. 39 (Eng. Trans., p. 42); in Ewald, *His. of Apos. Age*, Vol. VI., *Gesch. d. Volkes Israel*, pp. 52 ff.; and in Keim, *Gesch. Jesu von Nazara*. For the admissions of these and other writers, see a very striking summary in Schaff, *His. of the Chris. Church*, I., pp. 183 ff. The vision-hypothesis is not sufficient to meet all the implications of the historical situation. It is an extraordinary circumstance that there was no cult of the tomb of Jesus in the early church, as also that the eucharist (cf. the Ignatian Epistles) from the first was a substitute for the reverence which is shown and felt in other cases for the sepulchre. The discussion of the concrete reality of the miracle calls for a knowledge of the thought and experience of the church, and the most careful psychological analysis, without which facts cannot gain their full meaning. There is an analogy with the science of political economy, which, though dealing with the concrete and the actual visible transaction, is yet better carried on by the closest metaphysical reasoning, and calls for ability in the detection of logical sequences.

nature, while yet indwelling in it. Deity was greater than His work in the whole created universe, for He was represented by the miracle as not bound by its forces, but, in His freedom and independence, at liberty to transcend its laws. This was the weakness and the misery of the nature-religions, that they could not escape the inference that Deity was but part of the natural order, which were involved together in some mysterious process of emanation. The desire to separate Deity from the physical world was manifested from the first appearance of the Christian church, but the Gnostic speculations are a commentary on the method followed when this result was sought without reference to the miracle. The Gnostics condemned with an anathema the physical universe as a Godless sphere, while the Catholic creeds proclaimed Deity as the free Creator of heaven and earth.

The miracle stands also for the motives which inspire humanity in its active contest with the powers of sin and evil, whether as latent in nature or in the body, which hold humanity captive in the life of nature. The miracle inspired men with a sense of their divine endowment, as created in the image of the freedom of God, enabling them to believe in their divine capacity for heroic, impossible deeds.[1] It was the trumpet call to men to rouse themselves from their lethargy where they lay supine at the feet of nature,

[1] Cf. Cherbuliez, *L'Art et la Nature*, §§ 17, 18, for many suggestive remarks on the emancipation of man from nature by the power of the arts. "Architecture, statuaire, peinture, musique, et poesie, chaque art a sa façon particulière de travailler à la délivrance de notre imagination et à la glorification de l'homme. . . . Tous les arts tendent à une double fin; tous les arts sont une protestation contre la nature qu'ils imitent" (p. 220).

"Les individus sont pour la nature un jouet dont elle s'amuse quelques heures et qu'elle met au rebut. La sculpture lui arrache ce jouet des mains, et après l'avoir transformé par son travail, elle la met au défi de le briser. Elle substitue à la chair périssable une matière compacte, résistante, fière et précieuse, capable de durer autant qu'une espèce ou qu'une idée. Elle le glorifie encore en hissant son image sur un piédestal qui l'éloigne de la terre et du haut duquel il regarde les siècles couler à ses pieds. . . . La sculpture est, de tous les arts, celui qui a le plus fait pour accroître l'importance des individus et pour que l'homme se sentît l'égal de la puissance qui le détruit. Mais la nature ne s'en doute point: elle est trop occupée à faire et à défaire des mondes" (pp. 220, 221).

which they worshipped, and in the name of the Son of God to take possession of the earth and subdue it. When we regard the miracle in its historical significance, it becomes the symbol of the pre-eminence of spirit over nature. There is implied, in the miracle, it must be admitted, a consciousness of antagonism between the spirit in man and all else in nature which is not man; and thus is begotten a conflict, which, whatever the evils it engendered, has been the condition of human progress. When Christianity entered the world, it encountered the tendency in the popular heathenism to worship nature, to deify its forces, to regard its tendencies, however immoral, as constituting the law for man, or precedents for action, whether human or divine. In that class of writings known as Apologies, in which the Christian intellect first displayed its awakened activity, it was against the nature-worship, the mythologies of old religion, that the early Fathers directed their assaults. If we would interpret the spirit and purpose of the Catholic church in its fairest form, and in its promise for the future, it is to these Apologies we must go, as indicating how radical was the opposition between the new faith and the old decaying order. The Apologies and the Creeds are contemporaneous in their origin. In the one we have the exposition of the folly and the immorality of mythologies which were the symbolical rendering of the life of nature; in the other the life of One whose whole career is represented as above nature, the Christ of the creeds whose life is set forth as in its origin transcending natural law, and in its close culminating in events which defy nature and seem to violate its inmost secret. The law of death was broken, which had all their lifetime held men in bondage; even the law of gravitation appeared to be suspended, which made this earth the sole focus of human interests, the final home of humanity, to whose inner centre all things tended; and another centre of human aspirations was created, because Christ had not only risen, but ascended to His Father and to our Father, to His God and to our God.

The prominence of the miracle in the New Testament,

and in the creed and cultus of the Catholic church, constitutes a problem which calls for solution in any effort to interpret Christianity or its history; especially in view of the fact that Judaism did not give it an equal prominence and that Buddhism and Islam should have rejected it.[1] Some meaning, some practical result, must surely be involved in the circumstance that historical Christianity should have thus exalted the miracle, and yet have been the religion associated with the world's highest civilization, whose forces are still unspent and whose aspiration is far beyond its present achievement. In no other religion has the miracle been so incorporated in the organic expression of religious faith as in the institutions of the Lord's Day and the Christian Year. If the miracle be regarded as a revelation to man, not only of the freedom of the divine will, but also as the prophecy of his own freedom and of his relation to nature as its lord, which it is given him to read and to study but also to improve and perfect and subdue to his will, as it were so much material at his disposition, — if the miracle has ministered to the sense of his dignity and power and divine calling, then one can understand why Christian history should have been a greater history than before had been known, and indeed that history itself should be almost the creation of the Christian spirit.

The influence of the miracle, and of the belief in the

[1] "The Buddhist legends are full of miracles which Buddha and his disciples are reported to have done; some of these are precisely analogous to the miracles of the Gospels, but most of them are more extraordinary; and yet, in the canonical writings of the Buddhists, the words are preserved in which the founder forbade his disciples to work miracles, even if the people should call out for signs and wonders; the true miracle, he said, was that they should go and hide their good works before men, but confess before them their sins. In the same way, the Mohammedan legend narrates a great number of miracles of Mohammed, and yet he himself says in the Koran that he is a man like other men and he considers it unworthy of himself to work miracles, and appeals to the great miracles of Allah: the rise and the going down of the sun, the rain which fertilizes the earth, the plants which grow and the souls which enter into human existence without any one's being able to tell whence they come; these are the true signs and miracles" (Pfleiderer, *Phil. of Rel.*, IV., p. 83 [Eng. Trans.]).

possibility of the miracle, may be read in the experience of the Middle Ages. It appealed to the imagination and thus enlarged the range of life. To the inmates of the monastery, ignorant of the laws of nature and insensible to its beauty, to whom the natural order was evil and under the control of an evil agency, the miracle was a compensation so great that they did not feel their limitations. The emancipated spirit became a law unto itself, creating its own environment, revelling in the sense of freedom and power. The world was to them what they made it in imagination. In that subjective world of the Mediæval aspiration, the laws of nature were no hindrance, the principle of gravitation was scouted, new senses and faculties seemed to be added to the soul so that men could ascend like the angels, rivalling the birds in their flight, surpassing the brute creation in physical strength. As they came and went, the obstacles of dead matter offered no interference. The power of a saint, even in his grave, could be exerted to heal disease. Future events could be foretold. It was believed that men had returned from the other world and revealed its mysteries. The belief in the miracle created a world as beautiful in its way as that of the old mythology. These wonders of earth and air were instead of literature and art, the substitutes for poetry and science, and contain the germs of them all. If this experience which has now forever passed away has any lesson for us, it is in the revelation of man to himself, the protest of the soul against dead necessity and a blind fatalism. It is not a question here, whether any or how much actual objective reality corresponded to the miraculous dream of the monk, or whether the supernatural halo with which the people invested the head of a holy man was justified by the outward fact. We are dealing with what humanity has believed, and with the influence of that belief upon human development. At least the belief itself grew out of the objective reality of the miraculous Christ of the creeds, The effect of the miracle was to concentrate attention upon the greatness and dignity of a redeemed humanity. To this result ministered the separation of man from

nature. In the revolt against nature as evil, man came into closer relationship with himself. "It appears to be a law," as an eminent American naturalist has observed, "that you cannot have a deep sympathy with both man and nature. Those qualities which bring you near to the one, estrange you from the other."

In the miracle, and in the history of the miracle, we may trace the preparation for modern science. The study of nature with the determination to know its secrets, which dates from the age of the Renaissance, was not wholly a new departure with a distinct origin of its own, but appears rather as a Christian product, drawing its inspiration and success from Christian motives. No other religion has been so associated as has the Christian with scientific development. Indeed, science only exists where Christian institutions have prepared the way for its advent; and it builds upon the conviction which the miracle has aided to develop, that nothing is impossible to man in his struggle with nature in order to clothe himself with its power and to subdue its forces to the control of the human will, till it becomes the fulfilment of the words of Christ: "And greater works than these shall ye do, because I go unto my Father." There is, of course, the trite objection that Christianity checked the first beginnings of science in Greek civilization, by calling attention away from this world to another, preoccupying the soul with a future world, compared with which this present world and outward nature were but emptiness and vanity. But it was the heathen mind and not the Christian which first grew weary of the study of nature and sought in another world the interest which this world no longer afforded. It was Neoplatonic philosophy, or Gnostic thinkers drawing their inspiration from heathen sources, which brought the development of the old world to its close. The doctrine that nature was evil, and matter the source of evil, was in its origin a heathen conception. The church fought this dark conception as it was able by the doctrine of the Father as the creator of heaven and earth. If the church was not able at once wholly to overcome the conviction that the

world was evil, yet it was within the church as some foreign substance, which never gained formal approval as a dogma, an incumbrance from which the church sought to rid itself from the moment when it affected the popular belief. How Christian thought labored to this end, and how especially the Christian cultus resisted it, will be shown in later chapters.

But it must also be admitted that it would have been a misfortune for the natural sciences, if they had risen and flourished on the basis of the old consciousness that nature was divine, before man had been fully revealed as distinct from nature or as having spiritual possibilities which transcend the range of the natural order. So long as natural forces were deified, the human mind could not come to their study apart from prejudice, or from misleading presumptions. So long as man regarded himself as part of nature and had not yet attained by painful experience the consciousness of possessing a human soul, he would have been in no position to subdue nature to himself, to conquer the earth and make it his own. Nature would have exerted a tyranny over him as in those lands where human beings worship the animals which prey upon them, or have feared to rescue a drowning man from the waters for dread of offending the deity of the waters who may demand him for a sacrifice. Strange and evil have been the dreams begotten by the worship of nature, — unspeakable cruelties, monstrous imaginations, which have rendered human life a perpetual nightmare, on which tyrants have flourished and every form of evil has increased and magnified, till life became a burden and it only needed a Buddha to found a religion upon that premiss in order to bring relief. The consequences of the popular belief in the Middle Ages, that the world was in possession of the devil, may have been a temporary hindrance to civilization by discouraging enterprise, by creating fears of the ocean, of the mountain, or of the forest, but it was better so than to lie down supinely at the feet of nature, to resign the struggle to which man has been called by his constitution as a spiritual being. It was an inherent element in the religion of ancient

Scandinavia, that humanity was at perpetual warfare with the powers of nature, in the heavens above as in the earth beneath; and with this conviction the Christ of the creeds coalesced in essential harmony, who in His birth and in His death, as in all His intervening years, illustrated the superiority of spirit, and became the prophecy of its ultimate redemption from nature's power.[1]

[1] For a summary of the history of opinion regarding the miracle, cf. Köstlin, Art. *Wunder*, in Herzog, *R. E.* Among other interesting and important discussions of the subject may be mentioned Mozley, J. B., *Lectures on Miracles;* Bushnell, *Nature and the Supernatural;* Rothe, *Zur Dogmatik* in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1858; Newman, on *Ecclesiastical Miracles*, who has been met by Abbott, in *Philomythus*, with a severe but just criticism, and by Twistleton, *The Tongue not Essential to Speech;* Duke of Argyle, *Reign of Law;* Isaac Taylor, *Ancient Christianity.* Among writers of the eighteenth century are Middleton, Warburton, and Hume. For the popular scientific estimate of the miracle, Lecky, *His. of Rationalism*, c. ii.; Origen, *C. Celsum*, for the objections to the miracle in the second century; for the attack of Spinoza, *Tract. Theol. Polit.*, c. vi.; Schleiermacher, *Christ. Glaube*, § 14, gives the modern religious attitude, which finds no aid for piety in the miracle. For the most recent comprehensive discussion of the miracle, see Bruce, *Miraculous Element in the Gospels*, and *Apologetics*, cc. iii., iv., v.; also Fisher, G. P., *Supernatural Origin of Christianity.*

LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

CHAPTER IV

THE LIFE OF THE SPIRIT — THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT — THE RELATION OF THE DIVINE TO THE HUMAN

I

THE Catholic creeds assert the Divine Name, — the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, as that which separates and distinguishes Christianity from Judaism and from every form of heathen thought, while it also embraces in comprehensive unity all that was true in both Judaism and heathenism.[1] But they are silent, with an impressive silence in which is heard no echo of the controversies which have disturbed the later history of the Christian church. Opinion has been divided by theories of the incarnation; there have been different judgments regarding the relation of the divine and the human, men have disagreed about the results of the fall, the nature and consequences of original sin, the freedom of the will, the principle of election, the nature and method of atonement. These have been the points on which controversies have turned, about which there has been eager inquiry; they are all of them questions of importance and deeply related to the well-being of the church and to the faith and hope of the individual man. But the Catholic creeds do not determine them; they may be read into the creeds, but cannot be found in them. From the point of view of this majestic silence, it might seem as though on these points differences were inevitable, and were alike included and found

[1] That the doctrine of the Trinity embraced the fundamental ideas of heathenism and Judaism in regard to the being of God, doing justice alike to plurality and unity in the divine essence, is asserted by John of Damascus, *De Fide Orthod.*, I., c. vii.; cf. also, for a similar view, Greg. Nyss., *Cat.*, c. iii.

a common shelter under the all-comprehensive revelation of the Divine Name. The Catholic creeds reveal the unity of Christendom, despite its divergences and divisions; they represent an elevation from which the differences have disappeared, or are as though they had no existence. They may be recited in good faith by Nestorians and Eutychians, Duophysites and Monophysites, Augustinians and Pelagians, Protestants and Catholics, Calvinists and Arminians. They represent the Catholic side of the church, its "secular" aspect, as it was called in the Middle Ages, in contrast with the "religious" or monastic aspect. They are impersonal in their origin, but they reflect the work of the bishops or pastors in their parishes, not of the monk in his cell. They stand for historical Christianity, as it is called; and in form and in essence their origin is almost coeval with the birth of the Catholic church.

But this silence of the Catholic creeds, while from one point of view it constitutes a signal merit, reflects also the religious deficiency of the age which produced them. They exalt one phase of the divine revelation, the Son of God manifested in the world and in human history; but the fuller revelation of the Fatherhood of God in external nature, and the revelation of the Holy Spirit in the inner experience of the individual soul, these were spheres to which the ancient church was almost a stranger. But it is in these two spheres of the threefold revelation that the modern world has dwelt and still is dwelling. The ancient Fathers found a difficulty in defining the work and office of the Holy Spirit, partly because they were preoccupied with the office and work of the Son of God, partly because the work of the Spirit could not be understood, till after many generations had devoted themselves to the study of the life within the soul. The Spirit of God was to lead the church into the fuller truth, taking of the things of Christ and showing them unto men, bringing back all things to their remembrance, whatsoever Christ had said unto them. Slowly and painfully and by the bitter experience of life, struggling with the eternal

mystery, has the Spirit of God been fulfilling the promise of the departing Christ. The experience of many centuries could not have been anticipated in the age when the doctrine was proclaimed of the coequality of the Spirit with the Father and the Son. He of whom it was said in the Nicene Creed that He was to be "glorified with the Father and the Son, as the Lord and Giver of Life, who spake by the prophets," had much to reveal to the individual man, before it was possible that the full significance of His divine office could be even approximately understood.

But again, the ancient church was shut out as by the divine will from the fuller knowledge of external nature and the laws of God as written in the visible creation. The first beginnings of natural science in the Greek world led up to nothing. There was no interest in the study of nature, after the Catholic church became supreme. The love of nature still survived in the Oriental church, and begot a receptiveness for its beneficent influences. But what the church Fathers knew regarding nature and its deeper secrets, was what they could gain by superficial observation with the unaided natural vision. The eternal majesty and uniformity of law, the infinite wisdom and care and love disclosed in perfecting the details of animated existence, the fuller knowledge of the laws of nature by which it has been subjected to the service of man, — these were not revealed to them, but the natural world in which they lived was a meagre, inadequate construction of their own, feebly reflecting the greatness, the goodness, and the glory of God. It was something that in the Oriental church the love of nature still survived, a fact which was destined to color its later development. In the Western church, fear of nature became the motive which shut men out from its study, as if to penetrate its secrets was dangerous presumption and destructive to spiritual life. Hence in the West a greater opportunity was offered to cultivate an acquaintance with the inner experience of the soul. But while this process went on of exploring the inner contents of the spirit as they were brought to light by religious contemplation, yet still.

throughout the Middle Ages, it was the miracle in which they chiefly rejoiced, as attesting the power of the human soul. The Lives of the Saints have little to tell us concerning their personality or their actual history, but they revel in the miraculous power which a holy man must exhibit, as the evidence of his superiority to other men. Of the spiritual beauty and perfection of the character of Christ as it has at last shone out again to the modern world, the Mediæval church was ignorant; it was concerned with Christ chiefly in His eternal relationship, His supernatural power, His world affiliation as the redeemer and the final judge.

A change was in process from the close of the fourth century which indicates that great popular wants remained unsatisfied. The symptoms of the change were the sudden rise of the worship of the Virgin Mother, regarding which the creeds are silent, but whose rapid spread no creeds could hinder, till it became a most influential motive in the development of the cultus; and the rise of monasticism, which by the close of the fourth century had become a potent factor in ecclesiastical life. It is with the latter, with the influence of monasticism in the development of the Life of the Spirit, that we are now concerned. The influence of the worship of Mary is more closely related to the development of worship in the Eastern church, from whence it was carried into Western Christendom.

In the monasteries, it was the study of man, in his inner being and in his relation to God, which became the absorbing theme. Monasticism resumed, at first in feeble and uncertain ways, the task which had been interrupted, when Montanism was suppressed or its life driven inward to find outlet in some other form. Monasticism was also to prove the continuation of the efforts of condemned Gnostic teachers to build up all human knowledge into systems of theology. But it differs from Montanism and from Gnosticism in this respect, that the Catholic creeds have been laid as the foundation on which it must build. It may go beyond them, but it will

not contradict them in a formal manner; it may not do justice to them; it may even fail to preserve their true spirit, but it will be an unconscious perversion, not a formal denial of their meaning. The essential characteristic of monasticism in its work for theology was that it turned the attention inward to the discussion of issues that sprang from personal religious experience or aspiration, as compared with the Catholic creeds which were exponents of an objective impersonal faith, which dealt with humanity as a whole or in solidarity, which might be introduced with "I believe" or "We believe."

Such was the controversy about the Two Natures in the Person of Christ, which lasted for two centuries before it came to a close, and then it was settled for a part of the church but not for the whole, and was also destined to reappear in other forms. In this controversy about the inner content of the divine nature, as compared with, or related to, the human nature, the leaders on each side came forth from the monastery, — Nestorius, an Antiochian monk, who became patriarch of Constantinople, and Cyril, the patriarch of Alexandria, who had been trained in the monastery of Nitria. Eutyches also was a monk, who by his teaching regarding the body of Christ plunged the church into deeper waters of controversy. The leaders of the Monophysite party of the sixth century were monks, and so also was Leontius of Byzantium, who succeeded in giving a Monophysite interpretation to the decision of Chalcedon. In the following century, Sophronius and Maximus, who took the most prominent part in the Monothelete controversy, were inmates of the monastery. John of Damascus was a monk who gave the final expression to the orthodox theology of the Eastern church.

The coming of Augustine († 430) marked an epoch in the Western church. He held the monastic theory of life, and by his influence impressed it upon the Latin church; but more than this, he contributed the ideas and principles which were henceforth to be the staple material not only of religious controversy, but of profound inward struggles,

issuing in a new world of religious experience. No such book as his *Confessions* had hitherto been written, which narrates the inward life of the soul, its fears, its doubts, its hopes, which contains the conversation of the soul with its Maker. Oriental Christian literature is singularly devoid of what are known as devotional books which reveal the stirrings and emotions of the individual soul. Its piety tends to assume a conventional or objective impersonal form, or is clothed with a deep reserve, beneath which it is impossible to penetrate to the heart in its inmost moods. Augustine is almost the only man in the ancient church who has given us the revelation of himself, whom we may be said to know personally, as modern biography enables us to know our contemporaries. We know things about Athanasius or Cyril, but in the case of Augustine we know the man. With him individuality as a new force may almost be said to have been born, and to have passed from him into the monasteries of the West, where it was to be cultivated by inward piety, by the personal struggle of the soul for communion with God.

The questions which Augustine raised had never troubled the church in the East, such as the nature of sin, the fall and its consequences, the mode of escape, in what consists the grace of God which alone can bring forgiveness and freedom and salvation, the election by God of those whom He wills to save; these were the issues which passed over into the Western monasteries to be wrought up into theological systems and to reappear in the Confessions of the Protestant churches. It was by a monk, Pelagius, that the teaching of Augustine was resisted in the interest of a form of piety conscious of no inward struggles and resting upon an ethical basis, instead of an emotional. It was in the monasteries that the disturbing influence of Augustine's teaching in regard to the inability of a man to contribute to his own salvation was first experienced, as at Adrumetum in North Africa, where the monks fell into distress of spirit and despaired of salvation. Again in the monasteries of Gaul, at Massilia and at Lerins, Augustine's teaching found its champions

and its opponents. Notwithstanding the modification of Augustine's tenets by the practical working of the Latin church, predestination, which is only another word for individualism, has been for the most part the doctrine of the monasteries, in contrast with that other stream of tendency which is content with the Catholic creeds. As individualism developed in the Middle Ages, it struck an alliance with the reason in dialectics, giving birth to those monastic systems of theology, the counterparts of the great secular cathedrals, whose vast proportions and minute detail are at once the wonder and the despair of an age which has rejected them. As the great doctors in the Middle Ages produced each his *Summa*, so theological teachers in Protestant churches which have inherited most directly the traditions of the monastery, have continued to produce Systems of Divinity whose scope is the presentation of the whole field of Christian thought so far as it may be apprehended by the individual mind. Modern systems of philosophy also are continuations, in some of their aspects, of the method which Augustine originated for the Western world, when he plunged into the recesses of his spirit and laid bare its contents to the gaze of all. This inward process of individual thought and feeling has passed into poetry and modern literature, commenting on the same issues in their manifestation in the every-day life of the world, which once constituted the fascination of theological systems, the freedom of the will or the chains of necessity, the consequences of sin and the manifestations of hereditary evil, the working out of one's destiny, the principle of predestination by which one is taken and another left.

II

In the history of the doctrine of the Atonement may be read the process of human emancipation from the dread of Satan or of God, the two sources of fear which kept in bondage the Mediæval world. In the silence of the Catholic creeds upon the subject of the Atone-

ment, as compared with the emphatic assertion which was given to this doctrine in the Protestant Confessions of Faith, we may note the distance which the Christian world has travelled, as well also as the way which it has taken, since the ancient church made its profession of Christian faith. The death of Christ is mentioned by the ancient symbols, but in connection with His birth, His resurrection and ascension as forming an incident in His incarnate life. Whatever the ancient church may have held regarding the transcendent import of the death upon the cross, as set forth by individual writers or as embodied in its liturgies, the creeds, at least, make no application of it to the individual soul seeking to appropriate the redemption which has been accomplished and is offered in Christ. In the Apostles' Creed the forgiveness of sins is mentioned, but in connection with the belief in 'holy church,' a protest, it may be, against the Montanist teaching, that no forgiveness on earth was possible to one who, having tasted the gift of life, should afterward fall away. In the Nicene Creed, belief is enjoined in "one baptism for the remission for sins," a possible allusion to the controversies in Cyprian's time, when the bishop of Carthage maintained, against the higher conviction of the age, that when baptism had been performed by a heretic, even with the approved formula, it should be repeated in order to admission into the Catholic church.

The doctrine of the Atonement is vitally related to the development of thought and religious experience which ultimated in the Protestant Reformation, as also a dividing line ever since between the Protestant churches and the old Catholic order. Its prominence in the Confessions of Faith in the age of the Reformation; the importance attached to it by the Reformers, Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin; the controversies which have since been waged on its nature and method; the significance given to it anew by Wesley, when examining the foundations of his belief; its hold upon the religious experience in the Evangelical Awakening in England or America, — these and other indications point to some deep conviction for which

the doctrine stands, despite the variations in its statement or the difficulties attending its elucidation. Any full discussion of so important a point belongs to the history of doctrine; but the larger bearings of the subject are so closely related to the institutions of the church, that they must be briefly reviewed in order to a deeper appreciation of the meaning of Christian history.

The ancient church, like the modern, regarded the coming of Christ as bringing a deliverance to man, in which lay the source of the deepest gratitude of the soul toward God. The consciousness of deliverance from the evil which presses most heavily upon the soul may be traced in every religion, taking form and expression according to the experience of fears and suffering begotten by the different types of evil with which the history of the world has made us familiar. Such a motive lay in the background of Jewish religion, when the great deliverance at the crossing of the Red Sea, by which a people were redeemed from slavery and born into a nation, became the inspiration of later faith and hope, recalled annually in the great festival of the Passover. The Christian church accepted the Passover as an enduring type of the greater deliverance wrought by Christ, — the redemption of humanity and not merely of a nation. The Eucharistic feast and the annual keeping of the Easter festival bear witness to the consciousness of a deliverance from sin, and from the power of sin, from the evil agencies by which humanity has been kept under the dominion of sin. From this point of view the deliverance wrought by Christ is seen as the object and the effect of His incarnation, and is the answer to the question with which the Christian mind in every age has been consciously or unconsciously wrestling, Why did He become man, — *Cur Deus Homo?*

The largest and most inclusive answer to the problem, which the church of the Catholic creeds was practically unanimous in rendering, set forth the ignorance of man as the source of the evils in which he was engulfed and out of which he vainly sought to escape, his ignorance of the true nature of God and of His relation to the world;

ignorance of the true constitution of man and of his high destiny. Christ came as the enlightener, the light which came forth from the eternal light, to recreate or to rejuvenate humanity, to disclose to men their true relationship with God. In ways which could not be defined, He broke the power of sin and overcame its deadly fascination. It was assumed that the soul was made for God, and that when light was revealed, man by the inner law of his being would respond to light. To know the truth, was to be set free; the knowledge which acted through the mind upon the conscience and the heart, involved obedience: *This is life eternal to know God and Jesus Christ whom He has sent.* In this way the world was reconciled unto God and God unto the world.

While the ancient Catholic church put forth no formal theory for the expression of its conviction in regard to the deliverance which Christ had wrought, yet a theory did exist which lends unity and depth, as well as consistency, to the variety of utterances on the mystic significance of the death of Christ. It was assumed by Athanasius that in the incarnation Christ had identified Himself with humanity in all its fortunes, so that His life became a representative one, so that all men had been reborn or recreated in Him, all had died in Him and with Him to sin, all had risen in Him to the life of the Spirit in God. "He sanctified Himself, in order that He might sanctify us all."[1] "He took perishing man into Himself, renewing him by a lasting renewal into eternal life."[2] He endured death for us as man in order that He might present Himself to the Father in our behalf. "As He died for us, so also has He been exalted on our behalf, in order that like as all died in the death of Christ, even so we might all be unutterably exalted in Him."[3] "His death was a ransom for the sins of men and a death of death. He took the judgment up into Himself and,

[1] *Or. I. c. Ar.*, 46. [2] *Or. IV. c. Ar.*, 33.

[3] *Or. I. c. Ar.*, 41; cf. also Dorner, *Person of Christ* (Eng. Trans.), Div. I., Vol. II., pp. 341 ff.

suffering in the flesh for all, He bestowed salvation upon all." [1]

This conception of the redemptive work of Christ, which identifies humanity in its fortunes with its Head and Leader, is brought out with even greater distinctness by Gregory of Nyssa: "Just as the principle of death took its rise in one person and passed on in succession through the whole of human kind, in like manner the principle of the resurrection life extends from one person to the whole of humanity." [2] "Since there was needed a lifting up from death for the whole of our nature, He stretches forth a hand, as it were, to prostrate man, and stooping down, He came so far within the grasp of death as to touch a state of deadness, and then in His own body to bestow on our nature the principle of the resurrection, . . . as though the whole of mankind was a single living being," so that the resurrection principle of this member "passes through the entire race by virtue of the continuity and oneness of the nature." [3]

Beyond this conviction of the solidarity of the race in Christ, the thought of the ancient Greek Fathers did not go. In most of them, with minor qualifications, this principle was assumed. Out of it had grown the doctrine of the incarnation that He who was the Head and Leader of humanity must be God, since only God is competent to be the leader of man; but also man, since the race needs in its leader one who is identified with his followers. When this truth of the incarnation had been gained, its influence was felt in intensifying the belief in His power to emancipate men from the evil and corruption of sin. As a doctrine of atonement, it may be seen underlying the later theories about the method by which God reconciles the world to Himself, even though its explicit statement may be lacking. We may trace it in Anselm's famous argument, or in the discussions of the later Scholastics, or in the teaching of the Reformers, that the sins of men are imputed to Christ, whose righteousness in turn is imputed

[1] *Or. I. c. Ar.*, 51; II. 69. [2] *Cat. Mag.*, c. xvi.
[3] *Cat. Mag.*, c. xxxii.; cf. also Greg. Naz., *Or.*, XXIV. 4; XLV. 28.

to believers. One may read its presence also in hymns which have become the deepest expression of the soul, as it faces the mystery and the crisis of death:

"Rock of Ages, cleft for me,
Let me hide myself in Thee."

But this doctrine of the identification of Christ with humanity as the mode of deliverance from sin and of reconciliation with God, might be construed in different ways, as the question was asked to whom did Christ make the offering of Himself, or what was the power which held humanity in thraldom from which it was delivered by the ransom which He paid. From an early moment there are traces of the belief that an evil spirit held the human race in his grasp. This had been the teaching of the Gnostics, and although they had been condemned and banished from the church their influence remained as an evil leaven to affect its thought. The Catholic creeds had indeed escaped the contagion, but they were not sufficient to prevent the infiltration into the Christian mind of a sentiment which was widespread in the contemporary world. In the writing of Irenæus there are suggestions, however faint or confused, that the deliverance or redemption of man implied that an evil spirit had captured the human race, and that Christ had set it free, since the devil's rule was an usurpation, founded upon deceit and fraud, since also the sovereignty of the universe belonged to God. Irenæus may not have taught explicitly that Christ paid a ransom to the devil,[1] but

[1] Cf. *Adv. Haer.*, V. 1, 1; 21, 3. There is uncertainty whether Irenæus taught that Christ acted upon the minds of men, and thus set them free from Satan's power, or whether He acted in some fashion to induce Satan to relax his hold. Cf. Baur, *Die christliche Lehre von der Versöhnung*, pp. 30 ff.; also Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, I. 520, 521: "Dem Irenaeus liegt noch der Gedanke an wirkliche Rechte des Teufels an den Menschen ebenso fern, wie der unsittliche Einfall, dass Gott seine Erlösung durch einen Betrug vollzogen habe." On the other side, cf. the doctrine histories of Gieseler, Thomasius, and Dorner. Thomasius finds traces of the Anselmic theory in Irenæus; cf. *Dogmengeschichte*, III. 176. If Irenæus is interpreted in harmony with his remarks, V. 21, he taught that the redemption of humanity was accomplished by the successful resistance of Christ to the temptations of Satan during the forty days in the wilderness.

the early hints of this theory are to be found in his writings. It was a theory so consonant with current ideas that it was destined to wide acceptance as a controlling element in the popular consciousness. That Christ had redeemed man by paying a ransom to the devil for his deliverance was never, indeed, the formal dogmatic teaching of the ancient church. But most of the leading writers recognized some degree of truth in the theory. Origen gave expression to it so forcibly that he has been sometimes held responsible for its currency in the church. Even Gregory of Nyssa, despite his strong and clear enunciation of the higher truth, that humanity is redeemed by its solidarity with its Head, also countenanced the idea of some transaction by which the devil was deceived and lost his hold upon the world.[1] The same thought was countenanced by Augustine,[2] though it does not express the fulness of his mind upon the salvation by Christ, and from him it passed into the theology of the Latin church. Its original source was not in Christian revelation, but rather in the contagion of the darker moods of paganism, in the period from the decline of the Empire to its fall, when the conviction was bred that the anger of the gods was the explanation of the evil hour which had fallen upon the world.[3]

So long as the belief that Christ had ransomed men from the power of the devil was associated with or subordinated to the positive and larger conviction of the solidarity of the race in Christ, it might be regarded as an unimportant speculative tenet, which had no vital relationship with Christian experience, and as such it appears in the writings of Origen or Gregory of Nyssa. But in the church of Western Europe, this larger conviction faded away, if indeed in Italy or North Africa it had ever been held as it was held in the Eastern church. The work of Christ in the redemption of humanity was therefore reduced in its scope

[1] *Cat. Mag.*, c. xxiii. [2] *De Trin.*, IV., c. 13.

[3] Cf. Cyprian. *Ad Demetrianum;* and Augustin. *De Civitate Dei*, for the influence of this conviction on the church.

from an actual deliverance to a potential or possible one, the realization of which must be sought and obtained within the church.[1] But other changes also were in process of accomplishment in the Latin church after the fourth century, which were modifying the Christian outlook upon the world. One of these related to the conception of the Catholic church, which was identified by Augustine with the kingdom of God.[2] Instead of being regarded as an agency for promoting or realizing the divine will, which existed independently and found embodiment in other forms, as, within certain limits, in the state, or in systems of thought or ethics, whose origin was apart from the Christian faith, the church became to the Latin mind the sole representative of God's direct activity and interest in the world. When the papacy had developed its supremacy, the true church of God in the world was held to consist only of those in communion with the pope. A theory like this was incompatible with the older principle, that humanity itself, the race as a whole, had been redeemed in Christ.[3]

A change so fundamental as this implies some corresponding change in philosophical attitude. It was the transition from Platonism to the Aristotelianism which was destined to become from henceforth the accepted philosophy of the Latin church. According to Plato, the idea exists primarily in the divine mind and is always so far distinct from and independent of its embodiment, that the earthly form can never be identical or conterminous with the divine idea. Such had been the philosophical

[1] Dorner, *Person of Christ*, Div. II., Vol. I., pp. 1–11.

[2] "Augustine was led," says Dr. Harnack, "in his controversy with the Donatists and as an apologist, to idealize the political side of the Catholic church, — to grasp and elaborate the idea that the church is the kingdom of Christ and the city of God. Others before him may have taken the same view, and he, on the other hand, never forgot that true blessedness belongs to the future; but still he was the first who ventured to teach that the Catholic church, in its empirical form, was the kingdom of Christ." (Cf. Art. *Millennium*, in *Encyc. Brit.*, XVI., p. 317.)

[3] It is characteristic of the Church of England, in the age of the Reformation, that it reverted to this belief. Cf. *Church Catechism:* "He hath redeemed me and all mankind."

motive of the earlier church down to the fourth century. But such a conception implies constant movement and progress, or even revolution, in order to the attainment of some unfulfilled ideal. With Aristotle, on the other hand, the idea is imbedded in the institution, apart from which it does not exist, and where alone it can be studied. Hence the institution is consecrated as divine and final, and must develop from within, instead of through the concentrated gaze upon an ideal which is forever above and beyond the present attainment, or in the mind of God. Remote as these philosophical theories may seem, they are also closely connected with the practical. It is often said that the knowledge of God is essential as the primary requisite to the knowledge of man: that it is easier to know God than it is to know ourselves. But the Aristotelian method begins with the knowledge of man. Hence the foundations of the Latin church were laid in anthropology rather than in theology, as in the Pelagian controversy, while in the Eastern church the thought had revolved incessantly about the idea of God.[1]

Connected with this change in the conception of the church was a profounder change in the thought regarding God. This also was wrought out for the first time in the experience of Augustine. During the Pelagian controversy, he was led to attach a supreme importance to the will of God as also to the will in man, which was in marked divergence from the Eastern theology, where the supreme stress was laid upon the mind and character of God, upon the nature of God rather than His will. Religious thought in the East had for centuries revolved about that expressive word 'Logos,' which, however difficult it may be to define, stands in general for the mind of God, the reason of God, or the wisdom of God, in which mind, or reason, or

[1] "For three centuries or more Platonic idealism had been supreme. Aristotelian realism was now on the point of displacing it. The signs of the change can be noticed in theology and in politics. In one sense it was necessary as a condition for the development of mediævalism. The institutions of the past, which carried with them the noblest and symbolized the old order, were now emptied of their true life" (Bishop Westcott, in *Religious Thought in the West*, p. 222).

wisdom humanity shares in virtue of its constitution in the divine image. This Logos, coeternal with God, had become incarnate in the Son of man. As the Nicene Creed had defined Him, He was Light proceeding forth from or generated by Light; the Light of Light. The Eastern theology had not indeed failed in its own way to adjust the divine will with the divine reason, but so that the will should be always conceived as the executive of the reason. It was taken for granted also, that, in man, to illuminate his reason was to secure the obedience of his will. It had been a characteristic of Arius that he was out of sympathy with this conception, that his view of God and of Christ and of the nature of religion placed the will of God in the foreground and left the interpretation of the divine mind as something with which man had no concern or for which he had no capacity, — an anticipation, as it has often been remarked, of that strange religion which was afterwards to take its rise in the deserts of Arabia, whose prophet had no other function than to declare the divine will, and inspire his followers to enforce it by the sword.[1]

The Roman church may be said to have begun its independent career and to have received its most distinctive motive with this change in the conception of God, by which the divine will was placed, as it were, above the divine mind, beyond also the range of the human mind to interpret the significance of the divine action in the world. God's will was to be seen and known in the institution of the church to whose hierarchy, and more especially to the bishop of Rome, it had been given to make known His decrees and enforce their obedience. Leo the Great came forward with his proclamation that it was the divine

[1] When Mohammedanism was making its conquests in Egypt and Syria, there arose a controversy in the Eastern church in the seventh century, which was undoubtedly impressed with the influence of Islam. It was then discussed whether there were in Christ two wills or one. Beneath the discussion lay the assumption, foreign to the Eastern mind, that His work of redemption had been accomplished by an act of His will. The controversy was the least important in which the Eastern church had engaged, and the final decision was formulated at the Sixth General Council, with the co-operation of the bishop of Rome.

will alone, not any human arrangement, such as the dignity of cities, which had given the supreme authority over the church to the bishop of Rome. The controversies of the East about the Logos, or the mind and character of God as revealed in Christ, had already become unfamiliar. Augustine had written an important treatise on the Trinity, but he was unacquainted with the process of thought out of which had emerged the formula of the Council of Nicæa. The church Fathers in the East had endeavored to reconcile the triune distinction with the unity of God, but Augustine reversed the method and found the problem to be, how to reconcile the conviction of the one God with the triune existence.[1] The incarnation of Christ receded into the background and the church stepped forward into the vacant place. The spirit of the Roman Empire and of Roman law, which was identified with the will of the Roman Emperor, now took possession of the Roman church, transmuting its representatives into law-givers and its gospel into the New Law. A new age was beginning, of which the purpose and the justification was the training of the peoples under the lead of a priesthood into the obedience of law.[2]

[1] Cf. Harnack, *Grundriss der Dogmengeschichte*, p. 153.

[2] On the difference between the Greek and Latin churches, at this moment of their divergence, cf. Dorner, *Person of Christ* (Eng. Trans.), Div. II., Vol. I., pp. 270 ff.: "The (Roman) church and its ministers were not [as is the case in the Greek church down to the present day; for example, even in connection with the Holy Eucharist] looked upon as the instruments by which the living and ever-present Christ, discernible as it were by the eye of faith, accomplishes His work in individuals, — that work which He has reserved in His own hands; but Christ, when He had founded the institution, which is His kingdom, retired, as it were, after a Deistic fashion, into the background, and to the foreground advanced the present authorities, who represent Him in His absence." For the Deistic tendency in Augustine, which separates God from the world, so that He acts upon it from without, instead of from within, cf. A. Dorner, *Augustinus, sein theologisches System*, etc., pp. 392 ff. and for other references see *Register* of, under *Deistische Richtung*. Cf. *De Civitate Dei*, IX., c. 17: "Is that sentiment of Plotinus forgotten? — 'We must fly to our beloved fatherland. There is the Father, there our all. What fleet or flight shall convey us thither? Our way is to become like God.' If, then, one is nearer to God the liker he is to Him, there is no other distance from God than unlikeness to Him."

The teaching of Augustine regarding God and His relation to the world and to humanity gradually changed the conception of the nature of the deliverance which had been wrought by Christ. There was much in the earlier thought of Augustine which was in conflict with the conception of Deity which he reached in the Pelagian controversy, and which also passed over ultimately into the possession of the Mediæval church. The earlier view, which he attained when he was making the transition from heathenism to the church, had been substantially in harmony with Neoplatonic speculations, by which the world was in some sense an emanation from Deity and mankind was still related in some organic way to the highest God. In the Pelagian controversy, he took his departure from moral considerations, according to which Deity appeared as absolute and sovereign will, from whom humanity was separated by the original sin of Adam, and not only separated, but the whole race was condemned in consequence to endless punishment. The decree of the divine and sovereign will henceforth appears as the highest agency in redemption or deliverance; for only those whom God elects and visits with His grace are capable of salvation from the impending doom. In Augustine's own experience this had been the sole determining principle which satisfied his reason and his heart, as he reviewed the sore struggles, the long and painful hesitation, the sudden emergence into light, the consciousness he had attained of the love of God and communion with His will. He still preserved the formal principle of a deliverance from the power of Satan by the death of Christ, but it becomes subordinate to the consciousness of an individual deliverance wrought by God Himself, who had Himself imparted the faith and the love, and by whose act of sovereign will alone, with no merit of his own, the deliverance from sin and its consequences had been effected. It was the value of Augustine's position, if it could have been adopted as he understood it, that it brought each individual soul face to face with the infinite will, and after the struggles of submission were over, it entered into loving relationship with God.

But this doctrine, so novel to the church of the fifth century, had many vicissitudes to undergo and obscurations also before it was accepted. It can hardly be said of it that it was ever received in its fulness by the church of the Middle Ages. It carried with it the awful implication that the whole heathen world was shut out from the scope of the decree of divine election; or the still more dreadful inference that children dying unbaptized were forever lost to the beatific vision, for which loss it was but slight compensation to concede that their punishment would be slight, or their condition a tolerably happy one. Even those who were baptized, however, could not be sure that the divine will had decreed their regeneration in the laver of baptism; for regeneration, as Augustine held it, did not invariably accompany the rite. But regeneration was to be had only in and through baptism, and in this way he connected his latest teaching with the institution of the church, which was the kingdom of God in the world.

The Eastern church rejected this whole line of teaching, as firmly as it rejected the papal supremacy. Even in the West it encountered great opposition, as in Southern Gaul, where the influence of Irenæus or of Hilary still survived. An effort was there made, as by Vicentius of Lerins, to read Augustine out of the Catholic church, as if in heretical fashion he had denied the Catholic teaching of antiquity. But the doctrine of God as sovereign will, who had decreed existing institutions as the expression of His will, and the enforcement on the conscience of His retributive justice, was called for by the age in its moral decline or its revolutionary throes. But even among those who accepted the teachings of Augustine there were inward misgivings and painful doubts, as if the foundations of faith had been disturbed. The idea of God, as will, acting contingently, whose decrees were not determined by any principle of justice which human reason could discover, created alarm and deep inward uncertainty, which no exposition of the Augustinian teaching could remove. The result was, therefore, to magnify the

importance of the institution of the Catholic church, which now stepped in as a mediator between the soul and God, adjusting in its own way, and mainly by means of the sacrament of penance, the relationship with God, which the intimidated soul was no longer competent to adjust for itself.

From the time of Gregory the Great the Latin church was occupied with the solution of the problem which Augustine had raised, — How to escape the punishment which the divine will ordains for human sinfulness. There had entered into the conscience of man a sense of contradiction and misery never again to disappear, which the church endeavored to allay, but never with complete success. The theory was still held as theory, that Christ had delivered man from the grasp of the devil, but man himself had the growing consciousness that he was not the weak being which such a theory involved, — a mere prey of hostile external forces; a consciousness that he had failed in his service toward God, and that his own will was resisting the divine will, and that herein lay the cause of the misery and sin. It was, then, a great moment in the history of the church when Anselm arose to restate the issue and to express the deeper instincts of his age. Anselm saw, in the light of his knowledge of God as sovereign will, that the old conception of the world as subject to Satan, from whom it had been released by the death or resurrection of Christ, besides involving the unworthy principle that the devil had been tricked in the transaction, was no longer the deliverance which spiritual men with an awakened conscience demanded. The deliverance which was demanded was from God Himself.

The treatise of Anselm, entitled *Cur Deus Homo*, must be regarded, not only as exhibiting the capacities or the methods of the speculative mind, but as proceeding from the inmost depths of the Christian heart. We may turn over his sentences as ingenious exercises in metaphysical reasoning, weigh the exact significance of words and phrases and in so doing lose at the same time their spiritual import. There were, indeed, deficiencies in his thought. He was

inclined to acquiesce in the popular mood of his age, which regarded the escape from the punishment of sin as the highest deliverance which the redemption in Christ accomplished. He erred in his analogy of Deity with some feudal over-lord whose dignity and honor have been wounded by human sinfulness and demand reparation. In his comparison of sin to debt, he did not follow out the parable of Christ to its legitimate conclusion or discern its deeper and diviner application. But the positive value of Anselm's work lies in calling attention to Christ as the incarnation of God in humanity, as one with God and one with man, so that as man he pays the debt of human sinfulness,[1] while as God he frees us from the dread of God. As Christ delivered the ancient world from its dread of demoniac agencies, so He delivered the Mediæval world from the unnatural dread of God which the church was engendering. The escape from God was shown by Anselm to consist in fleeing to God.

Thus the *Cur Deus Homo*, proceeding not from the secular church of the hierarchy, dealing with sacrament and penance and priestly absolution, as the means of deliverance from sin; but from the cell of the monastery, where the problem was in solution by the more interior processes of the soul, exhibits Anselm as the forerunner of Luther,[2]

[1] In his treatise of *De Incar.*, cc. 5, 6, 7, 8, Athanasius appears as anticipating, in some respects, the attitude of Anselm. But the treatment is incidental and not worked out, and, moreover, is subordinate to another thought, — the solidarity of the race in Christ. No one can be said to have taught any truth which he does not labor directly and with special emphasis to enforce. But these incidental hints are always suggestive. Cf. Thomasius, *Christi Person*, III., pp. 191 ff.

[2] "Anselm von Canterbury, vielleicht der bedeutendste aller mittelalterlichen Theologen. Zwar hat er mit Augustin die Notwendigkeit des Autoritätsglaubens betonend (Proslog. 1, 1, 227: *neque enim quaero intelligere, ut credam, sed credo, ut intelligam*; cf. de fide trinit. I, 262: *si potest* [*Christianus*], *intelligere, deo gratias agat; si non potest, non inmittat cornua ad ventilandum sed submittat caput ad venerandum*), als Ziel der neuen dialectischen Theologie sich gedacht: *rationabili necessitate intelligere esse oportere omnia illa, quae nobis fides catholica de Christo credere praecipit* (cur deus homo i, 25; i, 400); zwar ist schon sein Theologisieren oft nur ein *ratione solvere quaestiones, satisfacere objectionibus:* allein er hat weit mehr gethan, als die Tradition formalistisch zu verarbeiten. Er hat auch nicht nur *exampla meditandi de ratione fidei* (Proslog. prooem. i, 223) gegeben, wie das *de divinitatis*

who was tortured by the inability to escape from the fear and the dread of God, until he found release in the conviction of justification by faith.

Anselm lived in the beginning of the age of papal domination extending from Hildebrand to Boniface VIII. (1050–1300), when the principle of papal absolutism was asserted without qualification, — that the pope had been placed by the will of God above kings and bishops. The will of the pope was then affirmed to be the source of law for church and state, while the pope himself stood above the law which he ordained, enforcing it or granting dispensation from it at his pleasure. He was not only The Vicar of Christ, but, as Innocent III. declared, *The Vicar of God*, to whom belong the earth, the universe, and all that dwelt therein. Over against this attitude may be placed the meditations of Anselm in his monastery at Bec, to whom it was revealed that the conception of Deity inspiring the papal monarchy was untrue. Even God Himself did not possess the absolute power that the pope was claiming, for omnipotence and bare will were not the ultimate factors in Deity, but were limited by the requirements of the divine nature. There were things which God could not do by the exercise of His will; He could not forgive sin except by some interior adjustment in His nature, some expensive process wherein the justice demanding satisfaction should be reconciled with the love which yearns to save. Anselm was an ultramontanist in his devotion to the papal cause, while yet he was undermining the lowest foundations of papal authority. He introduced a principle into Mediæval theology, from which henceforth it could not escape. If we cannot trace its

essentia Monologium (1, 141–223) mit seinem kosmologischen, das *Proslogion seu alloquium de dei existentia* (1, 223 bis 232) mit seinem ontologischen Gottesbeweise; seine *libri duo cur deus homo?* (i, 360–342) sind trotz ihres Formalismus ein genialer Versuch. alle kirchlichen Dogmen in einen centralen Gedanken zusammenzufassen (cf. Boso's Schlussgeständnis: *per unius quaestionis, quam proposuimus, solutionem, quidquid in novo veterique testamento continetur, probatum intelligo.* i, 432; vgl. § 23, 3); ja mehr als dies: sie sind die wichtigsten der Mittelstufen zwischen Augustin und der Reformation" (Loofs, *Leitfaden für seine Vorlesungen über Dogmengeschichte*, p. 157).

relation as cause to effect, yet the history of thought and of institutions was from this time a commentary upon its growth, until his idea of God was finally acknowledged as the basis of all government, secular or ecclesiastical, — that truth, justice, and love are placed above the will which enforces them in the world. Thus was won another victory for humanity in the name of the Son of God, coequal with the Father, without whose co-operation even the Divine Fatherhood could not be made manifest for human redemption.

The peculiar teaching of Anselm on the nature and exact process of the atonement was not accepted in the age which followed him. No later writer among the Schoolmen, with the exception of Bonaventura, fully accepted his conviction of an absolute necessity in the being of God for a satisfaction of the divine justice in order that sin might be pardoned. St. Bernard even still clung to the earlier view that a ransom was paid to Satan. But if the result of Anselm's thought was not accepted, yet his method of inquiry prevailed, that called for a study of the nature of God and the answering nature of man, the effort to get beneath the formula and justify it at the bar of human reason. Many were the questions arising in consequence of this method whose origin may be traced to Anselm's meditations. Was the death of Christ an expression of God's hatred for sin; or was it, as Abelard taught, a manifestation of His love, a divine appeal to the human soul? Was the death of Christ an actual penalty, a punishment inflicted upon Him as the substitute for man and equivalent to the punishment that justice demanded for all human transgressions; or was it not rather, as Aquinas taught, that the offering of Christ was a propitiation of the heart of Deity, to be accredited to the human family which Christ represented, wherein also the sin of man might be covered? Why could not God have forgiven man as one man forgives another? What is forgiveness? Does pardon take away the consequences of sin, or only remove the consciousness of guilt, reconciling the sinner to God, but leaving him still to endure its penalty?

Or must it be held, as Duns Scotus taught, that these questions are insoluble; that so far as reason can discern, any sinful man, aided by the divine grace, could make satisfaction for his own sins, if God were willing to accept it; that there is no interior fitness between Christ's work and the end to be accomplished? God might, if He had chosen, have reached His purpose in some other way. He might have accepted some other substitute than Christ, or have forgiven sin without any vicarious offering, if it had pleased His absolute will.[1]

It is not with the answers to these questions that we are here concerned, but with the questions themselves, in so far as they are the result of monastic meditations upon the problems of theology. They indicate that thought is becoming subjective, going beneath the surface of formal theology or ritual observance; that new foundations are placed for speculative philosophy and psychology, as also for literature and art. As the papacy did not fall until the idea of God on which it rested had been abandoned, so the Renaissance was impossible without this interior process, this deeper search into the moods of the human soul.

In the Protestant Reformation an equal prominence was attached to the two great principles having their origin and development in the monastery, — the doctrine of predestination first asserted by Augustine, and the idea of God as set forth by Anselm. The one stood for individualism in opposition to the unthinking tyranny of solidarity, and the other broke down the theory of the abstract omnipotence of God, — the motive and the model for human usurpations. Thus the doctrine of an atonement, whose blessing was no longer placed in the hands of the hierarchy to distribute, but was mediated by individual faith, became

[1] For exposition and criticism of the Anselmic and later teaching on the Atonement, cf. Ritschl, *Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*, 1870 (also Vol. I. in Eng. Trans., *A Critical History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*, Edin. 1872); Baur, *Die christliche Lehre von der Versöhnung in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, etc.; Schwane, *Dogmengesch. d. mittleren Zeit;* Shedd, *History of Doctrine*, Vol. II., and other doctrine and general church histories.

the safeguard of human liberty. The Calvinistic theology has sometimes appeared as more severe and rigid than the Augustinianism upon which it builds. But if it is considered in the age when it arose, Calvinism marks an advance upon the attitude of Augustine, who knew no doctrine of atonement such as was evolved in the Middle Ages; to whom God's will was absolute, undetermined by any motive in the divine nature which man could discern. The words of Augustine, beautiful and true as they are when taken as an expression of devout feeling, — *Da quod jubes et jube quod vis*, — become untrue, and a source of danger when regarded as an intellectual formula, the dogma of the unconditioned will. Thus the teaching of Augustine harmonized with Roman imperialism, and made possible the career of the papacy and of the Latin church. While something of this defect still inhered in the teaching of Calvin, it was in a measure neutralized by the prominence he gave to the atonement. The Reformed church which he organized became the unwearied antagonist of every form of imperialism, not only ministering through the doctrine of election to the sense of individual importance and freedom, but upholding a justice in the divine nature that requires the conformity of the divine will; and must therefore be followed by every human ruler who claims to rule in the name of God. In the age of the Reformation, when the will of God was made the lever of deliverance from the absolutism of the papacy, more than ever was it necessary to affirm that the divine will was determined by the divine nature. To get rid of contingency in Deity, was to take the first step toward constitutional forms of human government.

The history of the doctrine of the atonement since the Reformation shows the same characteristics, the same vicissitudes of opinion, that marked its discussion in the Middle Ages. In proportion as its legal aspects have been urged whereby the sacrifice of Christ became a vicarious penalty demanded by the divine justice, there has been a tendency to assert its moral aspects as they are called, — the reconciliation of man to God, rather than the reconcilia-

tion of God to man. The older language thus seemed obnoxious or irrational, when it spoke of the punishment of Christ, or of penalty endured by Him, or of His vicarious substitution, or the equivalence of His sufferings as the God-man for human punishment. Grotius endeavored to mediate between these attitudes by dwelling upon analogies of human government. In the eighteenth century the Deists were unanimous in holding that no atonement was necessary, that repentance was the sole condition for obtaining the divine forgiveness. But the interest in the doctrine was quickened again in the Evangelical Awakening, becoming a staple element in popular preaching, and giving rise to a rich as well as most voluminous literature. In New England more particularly, from the time of Jonathan Edwards, in Scotland, in England under the influence of Wesley, in Germany since the revival led by Schleiermacher, has the belief in the atonement of Christ gained a deeper hold in the Christian consciousness, illustrated and enforced as it has been by argument drawn from human experience in every age. Two writers in particular have added contributions to the rich complexity of interpretation which envelops this eternal mystery of the soul,— the late McLeod Campbell of Scotland, who regarded the atonement made by Christ as consisting in His rendering an adequate repentance for human sinfulness rather than in undergoing an equivalent penalty; so that His "confession of sin is a perfect Amen in humanity to the judgment of God on the sin of Man." The late Mr. Maurice took a new departure in his treatment of the great theme by his persistent appeal to the Fatherhood of God as constituting the controlling idea of all human thought about the atonement for sin.

In the light of this truth of the Fatherhood of God, speculative theories about the divine nature and its demands have been readjusted in accordance with an analogy, which the ignorant man may read with as unerring instinct as the erudite theologian. The will of God throughout the universe, and as related to every man, becomes henceforth a fatherly will, not to be escaped by man, but from which the

soul no longer desires to escape, since in the execution of that will lies the hope of the individual's salvation no less than the realization of the redemption for all mankind. The atonement of Christ becomes, therefore, not only the process wherein the reconciliation of God with the world is revealed and maintained, but it becomes still further the ruling principle of the Christian life, in whose imitation by each man for himself, but also for every other man, lies the soul's salvation. Christ offered Himself in life and death as a voluntary sacrifice to the will of the Father, and thus establishes the method incumbent on those who would approach Him. The law of sacrifice becomes thus the universal law for man. But it is not a law that God imposes, without having Himself first participated in its inmost essence. For it had been illustrated in the bosom of God from all eternity, in the relationship of eternal Fatherhood with the coeternal and coequal Son. In this way is secured more firmly, what the ages have been struggling after. The punishment of sin becomes a remedial agency; the divine sympathy is assured to humanity in its suffering; and beneath all events and circumstances of life, the divine will pursues its fatherly course of lifting men above themselves, above the conviction of sin and guilt, into the spiritual and moral life of God.[1]

[1] The modern literature on the Atonement is too voluminous to be given here; but mention may be made of Maurice, *Doctrine of Sacrifice, deduced from the Scriptures*, 1872; Davies, Llewellyn, *The Work of Christ, or the World reconciled to God*, with a preface on the Atonement Controversy; Jonathan Edwards, *Satisfaction for Sin*, Vol. I. (Worces. ed.), p. 582, which contains the suggestion afterwards worked out by Campbell in his *Nature of the Atonement;* also Bushnell, *The Vicarious Sacrifice* and *Forgiveness and Law;* Bruce, *The Humiliation of Christ;* Dale, *The Atonement;* Park, Edward A., *Introductory Essay* to *The Atonement, a Series of Essays*, etc. Among recent German writers is Hofmann, *Der Schriftbeweis*, 1860. For the controversy which his theory created in Germany, cf. *Deutsche Zeitschrift für christliche Wissenschaft*, etc., 1860, and *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, 1858. For the attitude of the Oxford School, see *Tracts for the Times*, Article on *Religious Reserve*, and Oxenham, *The Atonement*, which indicate a disposition to revert to the earlier attitude of the Catholic church before theories had been developed. A similar tendency is seen in *Correspondence of A. Knox with Bishop Jebb*, the earlier pioneers of the Oxford movement.

As one contemplates the many and conflicting theories of the atonement, or the vast amount of profound and subtle thought expended in efforts at its elucidation since the time of Anselm, the vitality of opinions which seem to have been refuted, the apparent impossibility that common agreement should be reached, — in view of this one is tempted to look with more complacency upon the liturgies of the ancient church, — the work of the bishops in their capacity of pastors dealing directly with the people and not dominated by monastic aspiration. In the ritual of the altar, no effort is made to explain the great transaction on Calvary, but it is held up before the people as if it needed or could have no explanation, or as though the simple event in itself spoke with direct plainness and power to the Christian heart. The late Dr. Bushnell experienced this passing mood, which has, however, a representative significance, when at the close of his book on The Vicarious Sacrifice he urged the retention of the altar language, notwithstanding that it had been "so long and dreadfully misapplied by the dogmatic schemes of expiation and judicial satisfaction." In the objective symbols of the altar, there might be a cure for the wearied self-consciousness forever seeking to square the fact with the theory. To the altar men could turn, "with confession and tender worship, without thinking, for the time, of anything but what is before us and is done for us." Without constant recourse to the objective forms of worship as creating a new element of peace and reconciliation, there was danger of turning the Christian oblation into a philosophy of Christ, a gospel without an atmosphere, our very repentance hampered by too great subjectivity, our subjective applications of Christ confuted and inefficacious. The language of the Christian heart, as exemplified in objective form, might go deeper than theories, as when it commemorates the death of Christ, "who by His one oblation of Himself once offered, has made a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." But in the further experience of the same writer, there is a continuance of the parable; for he again resumed his inquiry,

undaunted by his misgivings, with the result that he qualified the conclusions of his previous inquiry and gained a deeper insight into the mystery of the ages.

III

The doctrine of the Atonement, in its various statements and its historical development, may be regarded as the application of the truth of the incarnation to the inmost wants of the individual soul. It has also other aspects, as in its bearing upon human freedom, the deliverance of man from the fears haunting the imagination and the conscience. In all its phases, it presents humanity as looking to Christ for redemption. But as a doctrine, its history has been confined to the church in Western Christendom, where personality has had a larger, freer development than in the East. It has been pre-eminently the doctrine of the monastery, where the individual desire to appropriate the salvation of Christ has always been a powerful motive. Its development since the Reformation has been in those Protestant churches whose connection is closest with the monastic principle of predestination, and where individualism has been the religious basis. The Church of England as a national church has sanctioned no special interpretation of the doctrine of atonement. Likewise in the national churches of the East, there has been little or no interest in the inquiry, and thought upon this subject remains where it was left in the age which produced the Catholic creeds. But the Eastern church, as will be seen hereafter, was working out the same issue in a different way.

There is one problem, however, in the history of theology, wherein all the churches alike have been concerned, which from the time when it first emerged in the ancient Catholic church has never ceased to be a fruitful source of controversy. On this question also the creeds are silent, suggesting, indeed, the conditions of the problem, but offering no reconciliation. It is the question of the relation between the divine and the human; how they

shall be defined; in what way they are to be distinguished; whether they have any mutual affiliation or kinship; what are the canons of judgment for determining whether ideas, acts, processes, or results are human or divine. This question enters alike into all the departments of Christian life, Christian thought, and Christian worship, and lies beneath the principles of ecclesiastical organization.

The problem was first broached when it was newly realized that in the incarnation of Christ the human and the divine had met together. But the effort to determine how the human and the divine were related in the person of Christ revealed deep divergences of attitude in the ancient church of the fifth century, that no formula could reconcile. In what is known as Nestorianism, there may have been perpetuated something of the influence of Jewish thought, — that Semitic tendency which, placing the stress upon the ethical, regards man essentially in his difference and separation from God, and is unable, therefore, to bring together the divine and the human in the incarnation of Christ except in some formal or, as it were, mechanical alliance. Whatever Nestorius may actually have held, his name has become a synonym for a doctrine of the incarnation, allowing to Christ two natures, a human and a divine, yet not regarding them as interpenetrating each other but as remaining distinct and separate, allied but not united. The Person of Christ, thus conceived, becomes something non-natural, without close organic relation to humanity. The incarnation becomes the alliance of the divine personality with some individual man, and the redemption of humanity by the entrance into it of a divine life can no longer be conceived or understood.

Such was the estimate placed upon the teaching of Nestorius by Cyril († 444), his antagonist, the patriarch of the great church of Alexandria. The moral character of Cyril has met with unqualified condemnation, but as a theologian it must be admitted, however reluctantly, that he possessed no small capacity; at least he discerned that there was something wanting in the view of Nestorius, which he set himself to supply. According to Cyril's

view, the divine Word permeated human nature; humanity was taken up into the divine; there was mutual interpenetration, so that the human claimed the divine as its own, while human weakness and infirmity became the predicates of the divine. So complete was the identification or fusion of the divine with the human, that there existed no longer, after the incarnation, two natures, but the human had been glorified and transmuted, till there remained but one nature in reality, — of the God who had become flesh and had been made man.[1]

The history of the controversy in the ancient church over this issue, lasting for more than two hundred years, cannot be considered here. It was a history full of vicissitudes, of movements leaning now to one side and now to the other, illustrating the law of action and reaction. It was an Oriental controversy, but twice the Western church intervened, at the Council of Chalcedon in 451 and at the Council of Constantinople in 680, when the existence of the human, under Cyril's influence in danger of disappearing in the divine, was reasserted. The formulas of Chalcedon and Constantinople inspired by Rome, declared that the divine and the human were not to be mingled or confounded, while yet they were not to be separated or divided. The tendency in the West was toward a qualified sympathy with the School of Antioch, of which Nestorius had been an inadequate representative. But the tendency in the East gravitated toward the attitude of Cyril, — that the distinction between the divine and the human had disappeared in the one personality of the God who became man. Twice had this *monophysite* tendency also found expression in the councils of the church, as at Ephesus in 431 and again at Constantinople in 553. But the formula of Chalcedon asserting the two distinct natures in the one person, carried a weight hard for the Orientals to endure. To rescind it was found impossible after many efforts, but by means of a subtle dialectic, giving to it an interpretation in harmony with the Oriental spirit, it ceased to be a source of annoyance.

[1] Cf. Dorner, *Person of Christ*, Div. II., Vol. I., pp. 55 ff.

The Eastern church thus escaped the dualism between the human and the divine, but it also obscured the distinction between them, and thus weakened the motives of human progress.

There were many defects in the controversy, as in the failure to define the terms 'nature' and 'person,' nor was there a common understanding of what unity between them implied. The real content of the human nature had not yet been opened up to the ancient world, by the meditation, the anxious study, the inward experience of the many centuries which were to follow. There was an unconquerable tendency in both parties, the Antiochian and the Alexandrian, to define spiritual things in the terms of sense, so that nature was somehow conceived, whether in God or man, as a *quasi*-physical essence. The importance of the ethical was lost sight of in the failure to consider the essence of the divine nature as love. National ambitions, race prejudices, ecclesiastical rivalries, also complicated the issue. But apart from all these evils, defects, and failures, this problem of the ages was clearly enough conceived, and the actors recognized their true affinities, whenever the opportunity presented.

The discussion of the relation between the divine and human in the person of Christ inevitably involved the application of the same issue in all the relations of humanity to God, where the divine and the human meet. It was assumed in the Pelagian controversy by both parties, by Augustine as well as by Pelagius, that whatever was ascribed to the human agency in the matter of salvation was so much taken from the divine. The ideas of God and man were so far mutually exclusive that, to the mind of Augustine, no less than to that of Pelagius, what was done by man, whether in conversion or in human history, appeared to be so much done without God; what was done by God seemed like "a hand from behind the clouds suddenly thrust into the web of human affairs." From this point of view, the development of the ecclesiastical organization could not be regarded as divine or authoritative, in so far as it was an adaptation to human needs and

springing from the demand for their satisfaction; but a divine warrant and origin for the government of the church must be sought and somehow found in an explicit injunction proceeding from Christ through His Apostles, or the church was a merely human affair, of man's suggestion and arrangement. Thus the Roman church could not conceive that the divine will in human history might operate through human agency, thus sanctioning for a time the centralized authority of the bishop of Rome, as a means of unity and peace; but it was compelled if it would exhibit a divine claim, to fall back upon the words of Christ to Peter, with a forced interpretation having no necessary connection with the process of history.

It would be impossible to illustrate here the working of this principle, first exhibited in the ancient controversy about the Two Natures in the Person of Christ. Everywhere it is apparent in the interpretation of life; it was assumed in the monastery as the ground theory on which religion rested, and became the motive of resistance to the authority of the state or of the secular church, that what was of human origin could not be divine. The danger which the Roman church has always chiefly feared is Pantheism, the commingling of the human with the divine; while the error against which the Oriental church has guarded is Deism, the separating of God from man. But in the Protestant churches, also, the same controversy goes on with unabated interest, as it has done since the Reformation.

In the still debated question regarding the divine and the human element in Holy Scripture, we have the analogy with ancient controversy, the bond of connection which unites the modern with the ancient church in a common consciousness. Ever since the Bible became the authoritative utterance of the divine will, as with the Protestant churches, there have been these two attitudes, one maintaining its exclusive divine character and origin, and the other contending for the recognition of the human element, as if revelation must be made through human nature and experience. It has been maintained that the

Bible is a book of which God is the author, in such a sense that no human moods, weaknesses, or errors are to be found within its pages; as if God had dictated its very words to amanuenses, whose faculties were in abeyance, while they recorded the divine oracle. Whenever piety and devotion have been at the highest degree of fervor, the reverence for the unique character of the Bible as the Word of God has grown more intense and uncompromising, accompanied with a deep hostility against those who find in every book of Scripture a human element that has colored its teaching or through whose medium the divine has spoken. A resentment as fierce as the hatred of Cyril for Nestorius has been shown toward those who seek to trace the historical or geographical environment of the sacred writers, or who find in their utterance the evidence of contemporary thought, or the influence of contemporary systems of philosophy, or the intrusion of prevailing conceptions of God and man, and of their relations to each other. After three centuries of discussion, men are still propounding definitions of inspiration or drawing distinctions between inspiration and revelation, seeking some basis of compromise wherein the infallible revelation of the sacred Scriptures may be harmonized with the results of human research, as it seeks to study the personality of the men who wrote and the circumstances of the age which influenced them. But at the end of three centuries opinion is still divided. The new generation which has fed upon the truth in the Bible, as the veritable food of life, and in its purely religious preoccupation has been shut out from the intellectual sphere where scholars labor, is inclined to regard the work of Biblical criticism as a belittling and degrading of the Word of God, as though it were aiming to rob mankind of its most precious treasure, the supernatural Word, spoken from the heavens to this lower world.

The danger of such an attitude is not at first apparent. But as we study the controversy in the ancient church, the analogy of the dangers becomes more clear. There are points of view from which it is important to maintain

the distinction, but not the separation, between the human and the divine. For when a place and activity is denied to the human, as in the Person of Christ, or when God alone is regarded as the author of the Bible to the exclusion of the human agency, then there follows the strange result, — that the human, which has been thus disowned in theory, suddenly appears as in reality enthroned in the place of the divine. In the ancient church, it became customary in Cyril's time and afterward to speak of Christ as if He had no human nature, and then men said God had been born, God had suffered or thirsted or hungered, God had died on the cross. They spoke of the mother of God, the brothers of God, the grandparents of God. Jerome said of a certain woman that she was the sister-in-law of God. What in reality was happening was the loss of the humanity of Christ, His removal from human sympathy and comprehension into some unreal sphere, followed by the emergence of substitutes of every kind to fill the vacant place of the divine but also human mediator. So, also, if the Bible were to be made a book exclusively divine, and inspiration implied the suppression of the human agency, it would quench all other literature at its source; because when God was speaking, who would care to listen to the utterance of man. And not only so, but there would also result, as in the Monophysite conception of the Person of Christ, such a deification of the human intellect, as that the thought and the reason of man would be substituted for the divine Word. The human inference and human judgment, in which Scripture abounds, the local and the transitory elements in a progressive revelation, would be mixed and confounded with the unchanging Word of eternal life, till the very principle of revelation would be endangered, if not lost altogether. There is danger, of course, that Biblical criticism may be pursued in so one-sided a manner that the Bible may come to be regarded as the subjective working of the human mind, varying from one age to another, with no standard by which its products should be tested. The predominance of either of these tendencies is guarded against not only by the zealous

insistence upon the distinction between the human and the divine, but also by their association, inseparable and indivisible, in that mysterious process wherein the revelation is made to the world.

A beautiful light has been shed by poetry upon the entanglements of theological controversy, revealing that hostile disputants who could find no ground for harmony have, after all, been reflecting opposite phases of the same movement, — that instinct in every devout soul, coming to the knowledge of itself by the love of God and yet fain to renounce itself in the passionate adoration it renders to the divine. Thus George Herbert writes, in language recalling the confusion of theological distinctions between the divine and the human, and yet suggesting the method of their reconciliation:

"Lord, Thou art mine and I am Thine,
If mine I am; and Thine much more,
Than I or ought or can be mine.
Yet to be Thine, doth me restore;
So that again I now am mine,
And with advantage mine the more.
Since this being mine, brings with it Thine,
And Thou with me dost Thee restore.
If I without Thee would be mine,
I neither should be mine or Thine.
O be mine still! Still make me Thine;
Or rather make no Thine or mine."

CHAPTER V

THE PERSON OF CHRIST IN MODERN THOUGHT — DIFFICULTY WITH THE MIRACLE — ANGLICAN AND GERMAN THEOLOGY

THE points at issue in the doctrinal controversies of the ancient church were these: How had the divine entered into humanity in the Person of Christ; and How had the redeemed humanity of Christ become the world's possession. To these questions Cyril of Alexandria had returned representative answers, in harmony with the tendencies of the age. The human nature of Christ had been infused with the life of the divine Logos, the divine nature had also appropriated as its own the weaknesses of the human nature, till there resulted one divine personality, uniting God and man in organic indissoluble fellowship. The Logos did not unite Himself with one individual man, in order to form the Person of Christ, but the alliance was with human nature itself as a living conscious entity, while yet impersonal. Hence it could be held that humanity as a whole had been redeemed in the power of the incarnation, to share henceforth in the life of the Son of God. The appropriation of this divine humanity by the church and by each individual man, did not depend upon personal inquiry or self-conscious effort, but was mediated through the eucharist, wherein was offered participation in the glorified humanity of Christ, in the bread and the wine transmuted by the agency of the Holy Spirit.

In the modern church the same issues abide, but the mode and result of their determination is in contrast with the method and conclusion of the ancient church. In place of the ancient tendency to discuss the Person of Christ in an abstract way, as some geometrical figure might be explained, where spiritual things are conceived

in accordance with physical analogies, there has been substituted the concrete historical inquiry. Attention has been increasingly concentrated upon the actual life of the Son of God, as it was lived in the flesh, till Christ has become again the possession of the church as has not been since the days when His disciples stood in His presence and listened to His teaching, or witnessed His deeds of love and mercy. In this study of the Person of Christ, the stress of thought and inquiry has been laid upon His moral character, His human insight and sympathy, His spiritual elevation; and above all His consciousness of entire and perfect union with the Father, yet with no sense of guilt or confession of sin, or cry for forgiveness, — characteristics making His career unique in the religious history of man. In the Lives of Christ put forth in such profusion, or in the modern pulpit finding in the personality of the Christ of the Gospels an exhaustless source of interest and power, it is the moral character of Christ and His spiritual teaching that constitute Him the leader and the head of the race of man.

In this endeavor to study the inner life of Jesus, the modern church has the advantage of eighteen centuries of His influence as a force in human history, or of His redemptive power in inward experience, — forming, as it were, His spiritual psychology, as it is also the further continuous revelation of the Spirit. The Sermon on the Mount is read with a new and deeper sense of its meaning as the transcendent revelation of His personality. He is seen as in Himself the embodiment of the beatitudes He pronounces, — the meekness that inherits the earth, the quality of mercy in its highest perfection, the poverty of spirit to which belongs the kingdom of God, the purity that lives face to face with the vision of God. As the peacemaker, he is pre-eminently the Son of God. His soul, which hungers and thirsts after righteousness, is filled with the fulness of God. In the courage with which He faces the premonitions of persecution for righteousness' sake, He becomes the supreme ideal of martyrdom for the cause of truth and the redemption of man. This is the

Christ who speaks the parable of the Prodigal Son, the rarest exhibition of divine love which human language can portray, which, if all the rest of His teaching were lost, would still remain as the highest Gospel ever proclaimed to a world weary and hopeless under the burden of sin; the Christ who speaks the parables of the faithful servant, of the good Samaritan, of the shepherd who knows his sheep and calls them all by their names. It is He who sympathizes with the human humiliation of the soul in the presence of God, as in the story of the Publican who would not so much as lift up his eyes unto heaven. Again it is the Christ who cleanses the temple in the name of His Father, and who denounces the religious zealots and bigots of His age and of every age, — those who care more for the formulas of religion than for its essence, who persecute good men and multiply human sorrow and suffering in the belief that they are doing God's service. He is not of the world, but He reads the world and estimates its beauty and worth. His insight into the soul is marvellous, as in the beautiful instances of the woman at the well of Samaria; the woman whom He acquits and commands to go and sin no more; or in the commendation of the woman who in faith and humility would fain eat of the crumbs that fall from the Master's table; or of the centurion who had faith while still a heathen; or of the widow, who, in placing her mite in the treasury, put in more than they all.

Again with what divinely beautiful tact He deals with Nicodemus who came to Him by night; or with the young ruler who hesitates to sacrifice his wealth, while yet he would fain make the sacrifice of himself; or Zacchæus, the despised and hated tax-collector whose righteousness he recognizes as genuine and whose house he honors by his presence. And what words are those spoken to the savage robber who hung with him upon the cross. This is the Christ also whose love for little children, and appreciation of their worth, might have seemed enough to redeem humanity had He said no more. He declares the love and special providence of God as extending to the lily of the

field and as watching over the birds of the air, and His argument is that such love must be profoundly concerned therefore with the experiences of the sons of men, who are made in the image of God. He gave to His disciples, asking to be taught how to pray, a form of sound words, which every man in all the world might use,—so brief and so simple that a child may comprehend it and yet so profound that it contains as it were the philosophy of all religion, and so vast in its scope that there is no need of any other petition. Or once more that divine presence as it shines through the tragedy of His crucifixion, when, deserted by His disciples, He faces the agony alone, sustained by the presence and the love of the Father, into whose hands, at the last moment, with confidence unshaken, He commends His spirit.

It was a defect in the attitude of the ancient Catholic church, especially after the fourth century, that it lost the conception of Christ as the teacher, dwelling almost exclusively on His priestly function as exhibited in the sacrifice of Himself upon the cross. From the time when the office of teacher disappeared from the ranks of the Christian ministry, the function of Christ as the teacher also suffered an eclipse. But in the Four Gospels, it is as the *teacher* that Christ is presented, who by His teaching enters into humanity as a reconstructing, redeeming power. More than forty times in the Gospels is He called or addressed as the Teacher (Διδάσκαλος), a word whose full significance escapes in the rendering of it by Master, in the received and revised versions of the New Testament.[1] It was through His personality, His life, and His doctrine as a teacher, that His own spirit entered into human lives, as an inspiring, purifying force. The conception that humanity, in the language of the schools, is an actual entity and, like some physical entity, may be infused with a higher divine potency, becomes indeed a symbol of some

[1] Cf. Young, *Analytical Concordance of the Bible*, under *Master*. "In the Gospels the word Διδάσκαλος occurs forty-eight times, and yet in our English version we find it rendered by the word 'Teacher' only twice and by the word 'Master' forty-six times" (Morison, J. H., in *Memoir of*, p. 237).

greater reality, — a prophetic preservation in ritual, until the fuller truth has been restored. The entrance of God into human nature as a redeeming power, first in the person of Christ, and then passing into the body of humanity or into the church, follows the methods of human influence and development. As a recent writer has finely said:

"This is the office of Christ to the soul of every man. Entering so deeply, purging away everything that is impure or wrong, and yet so tenderly calling out and fostering in us every true and delicate affection, coming to us with principles so uncompromising and severe, reaching into the inmost recesses of our being, and yet coming not to destroy but to fulfil . . . not to destroy the smallest virtue which even in its lowest efforts gives some indication of the law of heaven and of every great achievement; not to quench even the feeblest hope, which, though enveloped in smoke and darkness, is still a prophecy of good struggling upward toward fulfilment in some better, more satisfying, experience, — so Christ addresses Himself to each one of us. Every faculty of our nature, by its appropriate exercise in Christian living, He would train, educate, refine, and strengthen, till God's purpose in our creation begins to be fulfilled in us. He lays His consecrating hand upon us, even in our common labors, and sets us apart for the highest end and fulfilment of our being. He reaches down into the inward soul of man, and, quickening it with His own divine love, makes that the controlling power within us, and thus exalts and sanctifies our work."[1]

With this vision of Christ, and this conception of His redemptive work as a power in the soul of humanity, whose influence grows with the ages, communicating itself from man to man as by the contagion of life, the modern mind has been so absorbed and preoccupied that the Christ of the Catholic creeds seems to many like a remote and artificial product of the ecclesiastical imagination. For the Catholic creeds are not only silent where the modern mind demands expression and amplification, but the Christ they present, with His miraculous environment, His supernatural birth, His resurrection from the grave, His ascension to the Father, and His coming again to judgment, is not the Christ whom they have learned to love and to worship. The two conceptions seem almost incompatible. The miracle has

[1] Morison, J. H., in *Memoir of*, p. 219.

become to many an offence and a stumbling-block, and even when not denied, it has been cast into the background of the consciousness in order that it may not check the growth in the soul of adoration for the Christ, who represents the glory and perfection of human nature, whose exaltation as revealed in Him they worship as divine. There are many who can make their own the confession of Peter, "Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God," for whom the Nicene or Apostles' creeds possess no spiritual or ethical appeal.

The difficulties in accepting the miracle not only spring from its seeming lack of sufficient evidence to attest its reality, but from other and deeper sources, in the minds of many who would fain accept the Christian revelation. The ancient Catholic church found no difficulty with the miracle, but at the time when the creeds took form, much was hidden from the gaze of that elder world to be revealed in overflowing measure to its latest descendants. To the revelation of God the Son in humanity, upon which the Catholic church reposed, has been now added the fuller knowledge of the revelation of God the Father in the visible creation, as in the discoveries of natural science; and of the revelation also of God the Holy Spirit, as in all the phases of religious thought and its correspondent inward experience, through the labors of the monastery in the Middle Ages, the work of Biblical scholarship in the interpretation of Scripture, in the higher literature, in philosophy and in poetry, as well as in the steady growth of free inquiry in theology. In one or other of these two spheres of the divine revelation many are living to-day, oblivious of the claims of the presence of God in human history. If one dwells in the revelation of the divine life in outward nature, there is to be found there no miracle, but rather a principle which seems to make the miracle impossible, — the uniformity and unalterableness of the divine will, the immutability of God, the sense of eternal, unchanging law. To the religious heart, as well as to the man of science, there is here a truth which the spirit needs and hungers after, amid the perplexi-

ties and the confusions bred by the opening up of the mysteries in the life of the human soul. Or one may live so long, and so exclusively in the sphere of the inner life, the world of subjective impressions, where abstract thought and inward experience reign supremely, that he estimates and interprets life by some individual standard; he becomes incompetent to go out of himself; he cannot escape himself; he becomes a law unto himself, and all which he cannot appropriate or understand becomes as if it had no meaning or reality. From the point of view of the natural sciences, the miracle in history becomes impossible; from the point of view of the inward subjective experience, it becomes unnecessary. In neither sphere is there any revelation of the miracle. No man now encounters the miracle; no one pretends to work the miracle; false pretensions are easily exposed; what seemed like miracles to other ages are often reduced to the manifestations of known law, — whence the inference that the miracle was never at any time more than a dream, some objective form given to the working of the human imagination.

It is a truth, amid the confusions of controversy, sometimes found difficult to receive or apply, that fundamental ideas may still be operative while the intellectual formulas enshrining them may be rejected as obnoxious or untrue. We may take, for example, such an institution as monasticism, which seems to have passed away and whose origin, history, and inward life are now studied as a curious inquiry; it may be denounced in some of its aspects justly enough as barbarous or inhuman, as injurious to human progress; while yet its essential purpose lives on, its outlook upon life is maintained, its spirit perpetuated as in the great divisions of Protestant Christendom. Its formal disappearance is explained by the fact that it changed its form in order to some higher and purer development and on a larger scale. The doctrine of justification by faith, whose meaning in the age of the Reformation there was no difficulty in understanding, the lever, as it were, by which the papal authority over the individual reason and con-

science was removed, has in later times been found hard to explain and has often been condemned as untrue, or if not wholly rejected has given rise to various attempts at modification and adjustment; while yet it is also true, that it has now entered into the religious life so deeply, as the essential constituent of faith and hope, that, like the atmosphere we breathe, it is taken for granted, with no thought given to its mode of working; or it is clothed in other forms of expression, literary and philosophical, as well as in the language of common life, so that it has become disguised and is not recognized as the principle in whose light every man must live and under whose consolation he dies. The doctrine of the atonement has been fruitful in theories, and the source of much controversy; it has been by many in this later age rejected as unnecessary, if not spurned as doing injustice to God and dishonor to man; in the nature of the case, it has been argued, no atonement was required. And yet again, those who deny the doctrine may still live by the light it has shed and the results which it has accomplished. For wherever any one believes that access to God is open to the individual soul, that no barrier exists between Deity and humanity making forgiveness impossible, there the doctrine of atonement has done its work and has entered as a constituent element into the atmosphere of the religious life. It may be said, therefore, of the miracle, and always pre-eminently of the great miracle recorded in the Catholic creeds, that the consciousness of dislike or of inward resistance does not imply its rejection.[1] As in the illustrations above men-

[1] In his *Bampton Lectures* on *Miracles*, when treating of the "Influence of Imagination on Belief," Canon Mozley calls attention to the consciousness of resistance in the mind to events unlike the order of nature. We resist many things which we know to be true. "If I take mere resistance for denial, I am confined in every quarter of my mind." "I conclude, therefore, that I may resist and believe at the same time." "Resistance is not, therefore, disbelief, unless by an act of my reason I *give* it an absolute veto."

"Such a reply," he continues, "would be both true in itself and also a caution against a mistake which both older and younger minds are apt to fall into, that of confounding the impression of resistance to a miracle with the veto of reason. Upon the facts of the Gospel history being first

tioned, the miracle has been so incorporated in the history of Christendom, that those who reject it still furnish the evidence of its power.

It must be admitted that the causes creating dislike or resistance to the miracle are not easily met. What was once so plain as to be almost self-evident, requiring no careful array or scrutiny of proof, is now confronted with objections which seem insuperable. The mind of the later age is confused, and the confusion appears in efforts to reduce the miracle to the domain of natural law, or else to present it as still the working of law, although unknown. By some it is defended as the evidence of the truth of a revelation, and by others the objection is strongly urged that revelation, if true, commends itself to the wants of the soul and needs no other evidence. Curious questions are raised as to when the age of miracle ended, or why it should have been discontinued. The credulity or the tendency to absurd exaggerations of the miraculous sentiment in the Middle Ages are imputed to those who first held to the faith in the resurrection of Christ. By some it is maintained that a miracle is, in the nature of the case, impossible; by others that it is not incredible, but is lacking in scientific proof. And again, that sense of antagonism between the spiritual man and outward nature, prevailing in the early church and throughout the Middle Ages, has now given way not only to a sense of reconciliation, but to a love of nature which has become so widely the passion of the modern world, as to make the miracle repugnant, if it is meant as a violation of the laws of nature. The human soul struggling with the problems of thought or aspiring after

realized, they necessarily excite this resistance to a greater extent than they did when they were mainly excepted by habit; but this resistance is in itself no disbelief, though some by the very mistake of confounding it with disbelief at last make it such, when in consequence of this misconception they begin to doubt about their own faith. Nor is it dealing artificially with ourselves to exert a force upon our minds against the false certainty of the resisting imagination, — such a force as is necessary to enable reason to stand its ground, and bend back again that spring of impression against the miraculous which has illegally tightened itself into a law of the understanding" (pp. 72, 73).

moral perfection, or the man engaged in the close, hard struggle for existence, with its clashing of human wills and antagonistic human interests, alike take refuge in the repose of nature, the order and the peace which come from obedience to uniform law, and to this mood the miracle is a disturbance and intrusion.

The controversy over the miracle has now lasted nearly two centuries, and has not yet reached its limit. It has not been, however, without its results, which have affected science no less than theology. There have been many efforts to reconcile these two antagonists, but they have proved of no avail. At this present moment in the controversy, it does not appear that the Christian church in its various forms has relaxed its hold upon the miracle; on the contrary, the crowning miracle of the resurrection has grown in the popular recognition, although no evidence has yet been adduced in its behalf which satisfies the scientific mind. It looks as though it were wiser for the present to accept the contradiction, as in itself containing the larger truth, while we wait for its reconciliation. There is but one ground on which the miracle can be defined and maintained, — it is not so much an evidence of the truth of the revelation, as in itself the revelation, a constitutive element, as Rothe has said, in the manifestation of God to man.[1]

[1] "Daher ist mir das Wunder ein constitutive Element der göttlichen Manifestation selbst, eben als das 'Zeichen' in welchem der über den Naturlauf erhabene Gott sich in der Geschichte unzweideutig wahrnehmbar macht. . . . Ich sage unbedenklich mit Martensen, 'Der Begriff der heiligen Geschichte ist unzertrennlich von dem Begriff des Wunders'" (Rothe, *Zur Dogmatik*, in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1858, p. 24).

While Rothe was strenuous in affirming the necessity of the miracle as a constitutive element in the divine revelation, yet he regarded its place in history and its results as so secure that he could write in a tone of genial comprehensive inclusiveness for those who, following Christ, rejected or found difficulty with the miracle:

"Let us beware of wishing to force those who are already in possession of revelation to admit its miraculous origin and to make their salvation depend on this belief. It is already much if the light of divine revelation shines upon them, and if they walk illuminated by this sun. If their convictions clash against miracles, I say to them: My friends, I do not wish to impose the faith in miracles upon you. *Beneficia non obtruduntur.* Are you not able to accept them? Well, then, let them alone. It is for you to see how you will, without their aid, explain history and the

The evidence for its actuality, as recorded in the creeds, must be sought in the history of the church, as well as in the faith and testimony of the New Testament. If the miracle be a reality in the life of Christ, it becomes the key unlocking the mystery of the larger purpose of human life, as revealed not only in the church, but in the higher qualities of Christian civilization, — the struggle to overcome nature and subdue it to human progress, to assert the freedom of the human spirit, constituted after the image and the freedom of the divine personality.

In the foregoing discussion of the Catholic creeds as related to monastic theology many points have been omitted illustrating the richness and many-sidedness of the process of human thought working upon the contents of the divine revelation, as compared with the brevity, the simplicity, the silence or the reserve of the creeds. Not only are the creeds silent upon the absorbing issues of original sin, the freedom of the will, the doctrine of predestination, and the nature of the atonement; but they give no definition of the church, whether it depends upon forms of ecclesiastical organization or whether variation in organization, such as that created by the papacy, affects its validity; they make no reference to Scripture as the Word of God or the authority for faith; they offer no theory of the method of revelation or inspiration; of conversion and regeneration, in what they consist or how they are to be distinguished, of these also there is no mention; the nature and working of divine grace is also omitted; the Lord's Supper, which has been so vital an element in the Christian life, is passed over, and the doctrine of transubstantiation so prominent in the Mediæval church; and as to the last things, the intermediate state, the later ideas of purga-

course of events which we only understand by their means. For my part, I do not admit miracles from a sort of dogmatic cupidity, but in a historical interest; because, in presence of certain incontestable facts, I cannot do without miracles as furnishing the only truly rational explanation, not because they make gaps in history to my eyes, but because they rather help me to cross over yawning abysses." Quoted in Lichtenberger, *History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century*, p. 521.

tory, the doctrine of endless punishment, in place of these is the simple confession of Christ's second coming in glory to judge both the quick and the dead, and the avowal of faith in the life everlasting, in the world which is to come.

The only theory in any degree explaining the form of the creeds, their contents as well as omissions, is the common understanding of the age when they appeared, that catholicity consisted in holding the faith in the triune God, brought home to men in the light of the incarnation; that in this faith, not in modes of organization, not in systems of doctrine, lay the essence of the Catholic church. The divisions of Christendom date from the moment when monasticism appeared and the age of theological controversy began, whether in the East or in the West. But as monasticism was essentially the principle of individualism, where the human mind appears as seeking for the deeper significance of Christian truth in its widest application to the needs of the personality, so the creeds stand and have ever since remained as confessions of the church in its totality or solidarity, the utterance of the "secular" church, as it was known in the Middle Ages in contrast with the "religious" in the monastery, where theology had its development.

It would be a mistake to suppose, as with Vincentius of Lerins, that the Catholic faith is in opposition to the inward and individual development of theology, as it began with Augustine; or that Protestant theologies inheriting the methods and traditions, as well as the spirit, of the great monastic theologians of the Middle Ages, in their desire to make theology the one complete, all-embracing science, have in so doing departed from Catholicity or violated its essential principle. Against any such inference all the churches alike in the age of the Reformation protested. Each put forth its supplementary confession of faith; the Roman church no less than the Anglican, the Lutheran, or the Genevan; the Greek church also was affected by the same mood, and set forth extensive and elaborate confessions. It was as though out of the long

interior process of religious reflection in the monasteries, each church was rescuing whatever was adapted to its spirit or its needs, so that nothing should be lost. The existing situation is a difficult one to grasp or to define. But it practically amounts to this, that the range of choice, whether of individual or national preference, has been enlarged since the Reformation, till, instead of two churches, the Latin and the Greek, there are many; and one may hold the Nicene Creed with the commentary which he prefers, — the Thirty-nine Articles, the Trentine definitions, the Augsburg Confession and the Formula of Concord, or Calvin's *Institutes* and the Westminster Catechism.

It is no easy task to harmonize these varying confessions with their contradictory attitudes and intricate distinctions, yet the attempt is now made at least to bring them together in some comparative estimate. While the task of the Mediæval and Protestant theologians has not been abandoned, and systems of theology continue indeed to be produced, yet they are forced to compete with a new method of theological inquiry which is known as the History of Doctrine. Since the last century has this new method of treating theology grown into increasing favor, until the question is before us, as it was never before the Christian world in any other age, What is the meaning of these diverse attitudes in religious thought; in what relation do these differing results of theological belief or inquiry stand to each other; what has been their genesis and their development? From this new method of procedure, much of the highest value has already proceeded, and more is yet to come. Already do the doctrine-histories form by themselves alone a large library, each of them contributing to the common inquiry. The student of theology now produces his History of Doctrine, as the Protestant theologian once produced his System of Divinity, or the scholastic philosopher contributed his Summa. The new method is in some respects a better one than the method it threatens to supersede; for it demands the effort to enter into the thought of other ages; it calls for the dispassionate love of inquiry for its own sake, instead of resting content with

justifying some one particular phase of theological development.

From the point of view of the doctrine-histories, the distinction between the creed and the theologies tends to disappear. But the distinction between creed and doctrine is an important one. It is not necessary to hold that they are mutually exclusive of each other, but something is sacrificed when they are put upon the same footing. In this respect the Church of England stands alone among the churches, in according to the Catholic creeds the highest place of honor, calling for their recitation, in the vernacular, as the Roman church does not do, in the Morning and Evening Prayer, as well as in the Communion Office, in the rites of baptism, visitation of the sick, or burial of the dead. The Church of England differs from the other churches, whether reformed or unreformed, in possessing no one name in the history of theological thought which is to her what John of Damascus has been to the Greek church, or Aquinas to the Latin church, Luther to the German church, or Calvin to the various branches of the Reformed church. Her theological confession in the Thirty-nine Articles is meagre compared with the Westminster Confession, the voluminous definitions of Trent, the Orthodox Confession of the Greek church (1643), or the Longer Catechism set forth in 1839 for use in Russia. It is a circumstance, in itself a commentary on her attitude, that no history of doctrines has been put forth by any representative of the Church of England. While the Germans elaborate their *Dogmengeschichte*, and labor for its perfection, the tendency of English theology is to seek expression under the categories of the Catholic creeds.

In the doctrine of the Nicene symbol is contained the Christian formula which, to-day, as in the ancient church or in the age of the Reformation, is the comprehensive formula of Christian unity. "What all the churches," says Coleridge, "of the East and the West, what Romanist and Protestant, believe in common, that I call Christianity." But this common element is the confession of the divine name, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the three as

One, and coequal in the one divine essence. The difficulties which this Christian formula of the divine name encountered in the ancient church have not yet been solved; they are only experienced with deeper intensity and involve deeper conflicts with the growth of humanity and the progress of time. The Greek Fathers found the problem to consist in how the Three could be One. The great Latin Father Augustine, who was unfamiliar with the process of thought in which the Greek Fathers were laboring, reversed the problem and strove to understand how the One could be Three. The deficiency in Greek theology lay in the fact that it did not know and could not anticipate the revelation of the Spirit, as it was to be given in its fulness in the course of time. Hence its external objective character. It was too much a thing of the intellect, apart from Christian piety, or from an actual experience; it saw and worshipped the Trinity in eternity, but not so clearly revealed in time. Augustine gave the first impetus to the subjective mood of the soul, wherein the Spirit works, who convinces of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment. But he maintained the unity, not by a full recognition of the work of the Father and the Son, but by subordinating it to the work of the Spirit. It was characteristic of his thought, that he found no place for the revelation of God in nature and the creation, nor for the revelation of the Son in the history of humanity; but he lived in an age when the interest in nature had disappeared, and when belief in history had suffered a rude shock, as the course of human development, by the barbarian invasion which was overturning authority and laying waste the provinces of the Empire. He sought refuge within, and clung to the God which spoke within the soul. Such was the imprint he left upon Mediæval theology.

To the modern world it has been given to discern the threefold revelation corresponding to the threefold Name. But the difficulty with every thinker, as with every devout heart, is to realize that the three are One. It is beyond the power of any individual man to live at once and with equal ease in each of the threefold divisions of

human interest and activity. We are still apprehensive of the work of science, as though it might demonstrate results in conflict with the purpose of historical development, or with the personal needs of the soul. We dare not wholly trust ourselves to believe that history is the record of a process of divine revelation, and, as a whole, carries with it a deep responsibility for the individual soul. The characteristic of our theology is still too much its subjectivity drawn from the monastery, as if it were solely an inward personal process whose problem must be solved by the individual reason, rather than by the larger reason of the race. But any scheme of thought which does justice to the divine Name, must grant an equal place, first, to the revelation of the Father unveiled to science by the study of the visible world; secondly, to the revelation of the Son — which is the revelation also of the Father in the Son — of whom patriarchs and lawgivers, heroes and kings, are types, who guides the life of nations in their secular no less than their ecclesiastical activity; and thirdly, the revelation of the Spirit, who worketh where He listeth, in literature, poetry, and art, but more supremely in the conscience and in religious experience, the end of whose revelation is to lead us into all truth, of whom it is better said by Western than by Eastern confessions, that He "proceedeth from the Father *and* the Son." But now these three are held apart; the working of the Spirit appears too often to the scientific mind devoted exclusively to the study of nature and of external physical laws, as an unreal meaningless dream, an interference with the well-being of humanity; so also to the historical mind contemplating history as a succession of outward facts or achievements, the inward life of man is but the play of the imagination; while to the theologian, too often, nature is a closed book and the history of the world and of the church possesses no divine weight of meaning or purpose. There is jealousy and estrangement, suspicion and contempt, where unity should prevail, because indeed it already exists. This at least is the teaching of the Catholic creed that the Three are One, for the One has revealed

Himself as threefold personality. Or as it has been summed up in the brief reduction of what the creeds were given to teach, where the claims of individualism are recognized and supported, while yet they are reconciled with solidarity: "I learn first to believe in God the Father, who has made *me* and *all the world;* secondly, in God the Son, who has redeemed *me* and *all mankind;* thirdly, in God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth *me* and *all the people of God.*"

Book III

CHRISTIAN WORSHIP

CHAPTER I

BAPTISM[1]

I

THERE are two features or institutions of Christianity which, more than any others, reveal its meaning and purpose, — the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. They stand forth as monuments against the Christian horizon at every point of time or space, even across the span of eighteen centuries. If we could imagine that the Christian church, in the course of distant ages, should vanish from the earth as ancient heathen religions have done, and some inquirer should try to interpret its secret by reading its remains, it would not be its creeds or confessions, its organization, its architecture, or its ritual that would best reveal the secret of its life, for these have varied with the moods and exigencies of the hour; but its two sacraments, which are not dependent upon hu-

[1] Cf. Smith and Cheetham, *Dict. Chris. Antiq.*, Art. *Baptism;* Bingham, *Antiq. of Chris. Church*, Bks. X., XI., XII.; Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. Chrét.*, Art. *Baptême;* Lichtenberger, *Encyc. des Sciences Relig.;* Wetzer and Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, Art. *Taufe;* also Wall, *His. of Inf. Bap.;* Dale, *Inquiry into the Meaning of* Βαπτίζω; for some of the more important SOURCES, see *Didache*, c. vii.; Justin, *Apol.*, cc. 61, 65; Tertullian, *De Bap.*, *De Coron. Mil.* 3, *De Res. Carn.*, c. 8; Cyprian, *Epis.* 64, 68, 69, 70; Cyril, *Cat. Mag.* i., xvi. 26; *Apos. Cons.* iii. 15–17, vii. 22, 39; the controversial literature which in the modern church has turned (1) on the method of baptism, and (2) on the recipients, is too voluminous to be cited here. For valuable remarks on the points at issue, cf. Bunsen, *Christianity and Mankind*, Vol. II., and Coleridge, *Aids to Reflection*, *Aphorism* xxiv.

man speech for their significance, which appropriate the physical elements of external nature as the most forcible expositions of the Christian idea: the water standing for purification, the bread and the wine for the sustenance of life: humanity purifying itself in order to sit down at the banquet of the Eternal. Into these sacraments, in the successive eras of history, men have read their hopes, their fears, their aspirations, till they have become summaries of the Christian life. Much that is irrational, or puerile, or superstitious, has gathered around these venerable rites, temporary accretions, local associations, heathen notions it may be, as well as passing philosophies. We need not seek to determine the exact method or degree of these influences; for such things are hidden from our view. But the appeal which these sacraments carry to the very elements of external nature, in order to make themselves felt and understood, has given them vitality and significance in the rudest ages. They not only bind together the Christian world into one organic whole; as Coleridge expressed it, they are not so much parts of Christianity, but rather they are Christianity itself, — the one the initial conversion or light, the other the sustaining, invigorating life. A line can only begin once, so that there can be no repetition of baptism; but a line may be endlessly prolonged by continual production; hence the sacrament of love and life goes on continually.

Curious minds may seek to antedate the origin of these venerable rites, carrying it back into pre-Christian ages, even to savage customs before the beginning of history. But we must learn to outgrow the fallacy that the origin of an institution neutralizes its validity; for certainly no cruder, grosser origin could be demonstrated than is now set forth by the scientific principle of evolution for the origin and descent of man. If Jews or heathens can be shown to have anticipated such rites as these, it only confirms their significance. We have got beyond the old apologetic, which sought to prove that Christianity in its doctrines, or ethics, or practice was something entirely new to the world. Its coincidences with other religions

or older ethical systems are so many fresh illustrations of its truth.

The doctrine of baptism in the early church is exalted and positive in its tone. It was spoken of as "the beginning and source of the Christian graces," "a new creating wave," "a water of life," "a second birth into a new man," "a union with immortality." But this language applies to adult baptism, which was at first the prevailing, if not the exclusive, custom. Previous to the administration of the rite, the candidate had undergone a process of religious education and discipline, lasting from two to three years, and known as the Catechumenate. Nothing could have been devised more impressive to the imagination, or calculated to stir the soul more profoundly, creating some inward revolution, than the immersion beneath the purifying wave, as the culmination of years of waiting and expectation. What the rite of baptism may have been as a factor in ethical progress may be inferred from the experience of Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, who was converted from heathenism. Writing to his friend Donatus, he says:

"While I was still lying in darkness and gloomy night, wavering hither and thither, tossed in the foam of this boastful age, and uncertain of my wandering steps, knowing nothing of my real life and remote from truth and light, I used to regard it as difficult, in respect of my character at that time, that a man should be capable of being born again: . . . that a man quickened to a new life in the laver of saving water should be able to put off what he had previously been; and although retaining his bodily structure, should himself be changed in heart and soul. How, said I, is such a conversion possible that there should be a sudden and rapid divestment of all which, either innate in us, has been hardened in the corruption of our material nature, or acquired by us, has become inveterate by long-accustomed use? . . . These were my frequent thoughts. For as I myself was held in bonds by the innumerable errors of my previous life, from which I did not believe I could possibly be delivered, so I was disposed to acquiesce in my clinging vices; and because I despaired of better things, I used to indulge my sins, as if they were actually parts of me. But after that, by the help of the water of new birth, the stain of former years had been washed away, and a light from above, serene and pure, had been infused into my reconciled heart; after that, by the agency of the Spirit, breathed from heaven, a second birth had

restored me to a new man, — then, in a wondrous manner, doubtful things at once began to assure themselves to me, hidden things to be revealed, dark things to be enlightened, what before had seemed difficult began to suggest means of accomplishment, what before had been thought impossible to be capable of being achieved; so that I was enabled to acknowledge that what previously, being born of the flesh, had been living in the practice of sins, was of the earth earthy, had begun to be of God and was animated by the Spirit of holiness."[1]

In this beautiful description Cyprian does not stop to distinguish between the long inward preparation and the outward act in which it terminates. Such is the manner of rhetoric in every age. But the stress of the description is ethical, — the transition from the death of sin to the life of righteousness.

The rite of baptism has undergone many changes in the lapse of time; immersion, which was the prevailing mode in the ancient church, has given place to sprinkling or pouring; the baptism of infants means something different from the baptism of an adult; and yet beneath the variations the essential idea and purpose of baptism has been preserved. In the ancient church and in the Middle Ages, it was held to be necessary to salvation, — a necessity so great that if a running stream was not convenient for immersion, pouring might suffice; or even the sands of the desert, if water could not be had; the baptism of blood in martyrdom might be an equivalent, where the actual rite was wanting. The universal necessity for baptism in some form was so imperative, that in the case of those who had died without it, there was an obscure practice of baptizing for the dead; and even in the Jewish and pagan under-worlds the rite might still be adminis-

[1] Epis. i., *Ad Donatum*. Cf. Stanley, *Christian Institutions*, c. i., who traces the analogy between such an experience as Cyprian describes and the regenerating influences in modern life. "With us these changes are brought about by a thousand different methods; education, affliction, illness, a new field of usefulness, — every one of these gives us some notion of the early baptism in its better and more permanent side" (p. 10). See also Stanley, *Life and Letters*, II., p. 148: "Marriage is the only event in modern life which corresponds to what baptism was in the ancient church, — a second birth, a new creation, old things passing away, all things becoming new."

tered. If these notions are now regarded as superstitions, yet the principle for which they stood lives on in the modern church, — an inward purification as the condition of entering into spiritual life.

While the Apostles' Creed and the Athanasian Creed are silent concerning the sacraments, yet in the Nicene Creed a clause has been inserted declaring that there can be but "one baptism for the remission of sins." The statement points to a deep and almost universal conviction, which also still abides, however its spirit may be evaded, that baptism is a rite which ought not to be repeated; or else its dignity, its majesty, its transcendent import, would suffer diminution. So deep was this conviction, combined, it is true, with other notions, that the church decided to hold baptism as valid, without regard to its agents, even though performed by heretics, by laymen, by nurses. When administered in sport, as by Athanasius when a boy, it should be allowed to stand.

After the third century the formula of baptism was the name of the Trinity, and baptism otherwise performed was declared invalid. But in the early church, as also in the Apostolic age, there is evidence that the baptismal formula of the name of Jesus only was not unusual.[1] There are difficulties connected with this circumstance which have not been explained. But the fact remains that, in the time of Cyprian, so important a personage as Stephen, the bishop of Rome, defended the validity of baptism when performed in the name of Jesus only,[2] and was opposed with great vehemence, as well as with every argument he could command, by the bishop of Carthage. In the controversy between Cyprian and Stephen we may trace the obscure hints of some crisis through which the church was passing. Those baptisms which had been performed in the name of the Lord Jesus must be either legitimated or condemned as invalid. To follow the latter course, as Cyprian

[1] Cf. Acts ii. 38; viii. 16; x. 48; xix. 5; with Matt. xxviii. 19; and *Didache*, c. viii.

[2] Cf. Cyprian, *Epis.* lxii. 17, 18; lxxiii., lxxiv.; and see also Augustine, *Contra Donat.*, V., c. 23.

proposed, was not only to follow Montanist theories, but to shut out from salvation those in the early church who had been baptized after what had since come to be regarded as a defective formula. The attitude of Rome was wiser than that of Cyprian. In a treatise belonging probably to the age of Cyprian, entitled *De Rebaptismo*, we may discern the process of the transition, the bridging of the gulf created by the ecclesiastical temper that was demanding the fulfilment of the letter. This unknown writer reveals to us the existence of an attitude in that hour of the triumph of the sacerdotal principle, of which otherwise we should have little evidence, at least in the church of the West. He urges the baptism of the Spirit as more important than the baptism by water. He pleads eloquently for the freedom of the Spirit, who, while He accompanies the formal rite, may also act independently, coming in advance even of the baptism by water (Acts x. 44, 47), and imparting His gifts before the ecclesiastical recognition is given. No matter how defective the form of baptism in its formula or in its agent, there must be no rebaptism; but if the Spirit be invoked, as in the rite of laying on of hands, in what was called Confirmation,[1] all deficiencies are overcome. But he will not admit that the formula of baptism which invoked the name of the Lord Jesus only is defective. Whether the invocation of that name in baptism be made by heretic or Catholic, it carried with it the potency ascribed to it by St. Paul when he said that there was no other name under heaven given among men whereby we

[1] The origin and history of Confirmation are in some respects still obscure. Whether the rite consists in anointing with oil, or in laying on of hands; whether it is part of baptism and should be administered in connection with it, or postponed as a distinct rite to a later period; whether it should be performed by the presbyter, or by the bishop only, are points of difference in the usage of the Greek and Latin churches. In the Anglican and Lutheran churches, the rite has been retained but no longer as a sacrament, and now corresponds with what baptism stood for in the early church. It has not been retained in the Reformed Church, but a profession of faith before the congregation has become its substitute. Cf. Art. *Confirmation*, in Herzog, *Real Encyc.*; Smith and Cheetham, *Dict. Chris. Antiq.*; Calvin, *Instit.* Bk. IV., c. 19; Mason, *Baptism and Confirmation.*

must be saved; or, again, He hath given Him a name which is above every name, that in the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, of things in heaven and things in earth. To rebaptize, as Cyprian urged, any one over whom the name of Jesus had been invoked, whether by a heretic or by one sound in the faith, was to do dishonor to Christ and imperil the existence of His church. Only this large and truly catholic attitude could have saved the church at such a crisis. To have rejected the baptism performed by heretics in the name of Jesus, would have been to call in question the validity of all the ecclesiastical rites. Who could be sure, so late as the middle of the third century, whether baptism had been always administered by those in Apostolic descent and with the formula of the Trinity? Not only was it uncertain, but many possibilities made it certain that the reverse was true. It became necessary, if the Catholic church was to exist at all, that the baptisms of the past should be legitimated, however stringent might be the provisions for the future. The unknown author of the treatise on Rebaptism discloses the method of rescuing the church from the disaster into which Cyprian's policy would have plunged it, — recourse to the Holy Spirit, whose invocation over any baptism, together with the laying on of hands, was the act of faith supplementing all supposed or actual deficiencies.[1]

The thought and the practice of the ancient church regarding baptism has been often and unstintedly condemned because of its unethical and superstitious character, or its heathen affiliation in attaching a magical potency to water as the means to a spiritual result. But it must be borne in mind that from the first it was also accompanied by an ethical training in the Catechumenate. The coexistence of a teaching church is invariably as-

[1] In his treatise, *De Spir. Sanc.*, Ambrose († 397) seems aware of the significance of this issue regarding baptism. "He who is blessed in Christ is blessed in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, because the name is one and the power is one; . . . So they were baptized in the name of Jesus Christ; . . . For when it is said, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, the mystery is complete through the oneness of the name" (c. iii.).

sumed also in the later administration of the rite, nor has the administration of baptism been allowed to outstrip the advance of the ecclesiastical organization, as though otherwise baptism would lose its efficiency. To this statement there are some apparent exceptions. There is a report that the Jesuits, in their excessive zeal, were accustomed to shake the sacred drops upon the heads of children as they passed, muttering the Christian incantation; it is even said that on one occasion they locked the doors of the building where the heathens were assembled, and administered baptism by the aid of a sprinkler. But if these cases be more than inventions, they only bring out in stronger relief the prevailing order, which has always associated baptism with a moral education as the condition of its validity. One exception there is, but in appearance only, — the case of children or others at the hour of death, in the confidence that the training interrupted on earth will be resumed beyond the skies. Again, it has been truly said that the primary aim of the Catholic church never appears as predominantly ethical, but rather the enforcement of institutional ideas, — the doctrine of the Trinity and the divine humanity, the solidarity of a race redeemed in Christ, and the kingship of God in the world. But these ideas constitute the soil or the medium for moral growth. It is also true that ethical culture is better promoted indirectly rather than by making it the direct and ostentatious aim. But whatever moral training the church has given was originally connected with baptism, or else has grown out of it as its inevitable consequence. So that the rite has never lost its significance as presenting the necessity for inward purification.

Among the many variations accompanying the history of baptism, the most important was the transition from adult to infant baptism. It is possible that infant baptism was practised to some extent from the first, or even that it was administered by the Apostles. But there is no demonstrative evidence on this point to which we can appeal. That the prevailing custom in the early church was adult

baptism is admitted. Evidence that a change was taking place is abundant in the third century. This change is one of the most significant that has passed over the history of the church. Adult baptism stood for the principle of individualism, demanding intelligence as the condition of repentance and faith, and the personal vow of obedience as the ground of its proper administration. But the social aim of the church, looking to the welfare of all, taking men in their collective capacity as a whole, the need for an institution representing the solidarity of the Christian world in its common hopes and fears, — this necessity influenced the transition from adult to infant baptism. The principle of individualism, the characteristic of the church of the first three centuries, was passing into desuetude. The church had a work to do for the people which they could not do for themselves. The obligation of humanity to the church became universal. It was to become no longer a question of "joining the church" as the expression goes; the union of individuals no longer created the church. The world of man was henceforth to be created within the church; infants from their birth were to be received into its fold. The transition at least bore witness to the faith that all men were capable of receiving a divine nurture, and that education is the divine method of evoking the image of God in man.

Whether such a change was justifiable or not is a question that has been much discussed. It may be assumed as the prerogative of the church that it has the divine right to adapt its institutions to the changes of life. In accordance with this principle, a deep Christian instinct must be further assumed as underlying the requirement that the baptism of the infant should be performed at the earliest possible moment — the conviction of the sanctity of human life from the moment of its appearance. It may be that this conviction could not have become universally potent if it had not been associated with another belief, that the salvation of the child was imperilled by any delay. To this usage of infant baptism must be traced the extinction of the practice of infanticide, so common in the

old world as to be regarded with no disapproval, and prevailing in the highest society in the Roman Empire at the coming of Christ. Such a custom could not be broken up by denunciation or by legislation, or by the permeation of a gradual moral influence; it required an immediate act enforced by the most powerful sanctions. The doctrine of infant damnation is, indeed, the most horrible in the category of human beliefs; but it may have been the degraded form in a conventional theology of an unreasoning instinct, that tended originally to promote the value of a human soul, or to kill the hard indifference, the cruel stolidity, which exposed children to death, at the whim of parental authority. It is a truth whose confirmation is abundant in the history of the church, that those beliefs or institutions that seem irrational or absurd or unworthy of the Christian spirit, have come into vogue in order to kill some deeper evils, not otherwise to have been destroyed.

And, again, it is clear that if the church was to gain any hold upon the society of the old world, which was to pass away, or upon the new races that were to take their place, it must receive them into its fold as they were. It was no time to wait until they had experienced what is called conversion. The institution of the Catechumenate, which carefully trained the individual, as a preparation for baptism, had begun to decline when the heathens from the age of Constantine were flocking into the church in large numbers. It was impossible to apply this method of training before baptism to the new races as they were converted to Christianity. They believed they could enter the church by baptism as they entered the Empire by conquest. When Clovis was converted in the sixth century he had some doubts as to whether his people would follow him. But when they were consulted, they replied that they were ready, and with their leader they went down by thousands into the regenerating wave. Of them all it was proclaimed alike that they were children of God, members of Christ, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven. In other words, they shared in a divine hu-

manity, constituting their title to the blessings that the church might hold in store. Their redemption had been potentially accomplished by the revelation of Christ, which showed what humanity was, or might become; this potential redemption was to be made actual within the church, if the church fulfilled the obligations it had assumed. And at least the effort was made to fulfil them. The training which hitherto had preceded baptism was now placed after the rite, and was known as Discipline. A vast educational system was developed, by which the church sought to implant the first principles of moral culture. So great importance was attached to discipline that it was finally enumerated among the sacraments which are necessary to salvation. The sacrament of baptism must be made effective by means of the sacrament of penance.

II

The Mediæval church differed from the church of the first three centuries in placing the ethical training and discipline after baptism, instead of before baptism, as the indispensable means of its reception. The fourth century is the age of transition when the Catechumenate began to yield as an institution to a system known as penitential, whose object was to meet the needs of the offender who had sinned after baptism. What is known as the sacrament of penance came to rival in importance and necessity the baptismal rite. Thus there grew up a system of discipline which, while it was the creation of the hierarchy, was also a response to popular religious needs.[1] To this system of discipline the clergy also were amenable, and,

[1] On the subject of Discipline, cf., in general, *Acts of Councils* and *Capitularies of Charlemagne;* Migne, *Patro. Lat.*, Vol. XCIX. for the *Penitential Books;* Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils* and *Eccles. Documents rel. to Great Britain and Ireland;* Smith and Cheetham, Arts. *Penance, Penitential Books;* Bingham, Bk. XIV.; Wetzer and Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, II., *Bussdisciplin;* Lea, *His. of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church* (1896); Wasserschleben, *Bussordnungen d. abendländ. Kirche;* Marshall, *Penitential Discipline of the Primitive Church;* also Gieseler, *Ec. His.*, II., and Schaff, *Ch. His.*, IV.

indeed, in theory it was so devised as to bear more heavily upon the priesthood than on the people. Where the layman was punished lightly by fine, the priest was liable to deposition or excommunication. Such was the theory, even if not carried out into practice. The papacy strove for exemption from the possibilities of humiliation under such a system, and may be said to have stood above the system until at the last moment, when discipline was beginning to pass away, the popes themselves, as at the Reformatory Councils in the fifteenth century, were brought into subjection to its control.

In what are known as the "penitential books," we have the first rude treatises in ethics. Taking them in relation to their age, they aim at inculcating those duties that relate to the well-being of the social order. The sins most hurtful to society were, for the most part, those known as mortal sins. As society was constituted in the church, heresy became the greatest sin because it seemed like a deadly blow to the life of the ecclesiastical order on which social regeneration was depending. But the penitential books are not without the recognition of offences injurious to the personality more than the social order. When the system of discipline first began to be developed, its application was chiefly, if not exclusively, to sins open and known, which brought scandal upon the church. From open sins the transition was easy and natural to secret sins known only to the offender. The working of the human conscience led inevitably to the confessional, it was a method of relief sought by the people, quite as much as imposed upon them from without. It never could have arisen, of course, in an age when the sense of individuality was strong; for a deep personality rebels against the lifting of the veil that shrouds the sanctuary of the inner life. The confessional was at first a voluntary method of seeking relief. It is well to recall that even under this milder form a great man like St. Jerome protested against the growing conviction that the priest could grant absolution, or that his intervention was needed between the soul and God. But Leo the Great stated what

people were already inclined to believe, that only through sacerdotal mediation could pardon be secured. The human race in that age had begun to be afraid of dealing directly with God; in its weakness and fear, it was experiencing the mood of the ancient Hebrew people gathered together in fright at the foot of Horeb, or addressing the lawgiver as he came down from the mountain: "Speak *thou* to us; let not God speak to us or we die."

The hierarchy of the Latin church took charge of this whole department of human life because in those days no state any longer existed strong enough to enforce obedience to moral law; nor was the moral capital of the old Roman world sufficient for the emergency. The order of the civil state was yet among the possibilities of the distant future. The disasters of the social revolution in the age of the invasion of the barbarians had made the moral situation worse even than before. Thus the German people, who had moral convictions and moral codes before they entered the Empire, had degenerated in consequence of their contact with the Empire into an indescribable moral degradation. Their leaders felt no restrictions of law or authority, exhibiting their brutal or sensual impulses without restraint, and the corruption of their followers was a matter of course. Under these circumstances, any power was to be welcomed which could insure order, or create the sentiment of wrong, or rouse the conscience to the dread of evil. The most fearful penalties the imagination could conceive were not too strong to be invoked in the attempt to develop the moral sense. In view of the situation, it may have been inevitable that the penitential systems should be enforced by all the terrors at the command of the clergy. In acting as the substitute for the state, the church had no punishments at her disposal except those appealing to the spiritual imagination. Perhaps, also, it was necessary and desirable that the human soul should be turned inside out, as it were, in the confessional in order to know itself and be known in its evil capacity and its dark proclivities. The state now does what the church attempted then. When a

man becomes liable for his offence to the civil law, there is no respect for his personality at the hands of lawyer or judges. The inner life is ruthlessly invaded, the sacred sense of reserve is forced to give way as almost the worst punishment the offender can be called upon to endure. Something like this was the function of the confessional in the Middle Ages. The sacredness of the individual life, whose citadel should be held secure from intrusion, whose only confessional should be the Word of God, the pulpit of the preacher, or the revelation of literature, was then violated without protest or murmur.

As the desire or the necessity for the confessional developed, the language of Christ was recalled, as its divine justification: "Whosesoever sins ye remit shall be remitted; and whosesoever sins ye retain they shall be retained; Whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven, or whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven." Sublimer words were never uttered if we take them in their truest, which is also their largest, meaning. They proclaim the endowment of humanity in the life of the spirit with the power of discerning moral truth; they constitute the commission of the Christian preacher; they imply the unchanging essence of moral distinctions, so that the morality of earth is one with the morality of heaven. The verdict of the conscience becomes the verdict of God. Much as these words may have been or still are perverted by false limitations, the principle they contain may yet be traced in the discipline of the hierarchy, in the days of its power and in its better aspects, when it stood for the conscience of man. However great or numerous the misapplications of the ethical ideal may have been in the Middle Ages, the truth was never entirely obscured. What humanity in the main then condemned as wrong has ever since been condemned; and the condemnation has been ratified in heaven. The consensus as to what constitute the moral duties of life has not varied in essentials; with some qualifications there is also substantial agreement in the ethical codes of the world.

The chief interest in the study of discipline does not lie in seeking for the justification either of its principles or methods; about these we are now substantially agreed; we say that it may have been necessary for the age, and so dismiss the subject. There is another line of inquiry which is more interesting, — to note the defects in the penitential system and trace them to their remoter causes. Some inherent evil there was in the method adopted for grounding men in moral distinctions. The penitential books gave lists of offences, graded for the most part after some external or social standard, from the most heinous down to the least venial. Over against each offence stood the amount of penance required, either in fasting or stripes, which might also be commuted into money payments. In such a system the outward act, and not the inward motive, could alone be estimated. No mortal man could weigh the inner motive and assign a penance relatively exact. The monk Abelard, in the twelfth century, proposed to the world a new principle, whose tendency was toward individualism as contrasted with solidarity, when he said that the essence of sin lay in the motive. But the church did not accept the suggestion, and, indeed, it could not, without abandoning its social aim, the object of its existence. And, again, if the motive is that which it is most important to reach, still it remains true that the outward act must be estimated to some extent apart from the motive; or that the motive must be artificially estimated as the most heinous whose result hurts most deeply the constitution of the social order. It was also through the consciousness of the outward act, that the painful experience must be gained of the strength and persistency of the evil motive. But at this point the discipline was weak, revealing a great gap; it called for some profound modification at its very root, which should bring the soul into relation with Him unto whom all hearts are open. The social aim was not exhaustive; there was a wide range of duties, a higher aspiration, which the penitential system did not and could not reach. The defect of ecclesiastical discipline was revealed in

this — that too often those suffered the heaviest punishment at the hands of the church who were innocent before God, or, indeed, might merit the divine approval.

It was another evil in this method of discipline that the custom of fines for the various offences, a custom the church adopted because it found it already in vogue among the German peoples, bore more hardly upon the poor than on the rich. A man with money at his disposal could do penance for sins with ease, which it would take a poor man a lifetime to expiate. Nor could they rid themselves, in that age, of the idea that the punishment of a substitute was as effective as the actual suffering of the offender himself. Even the Venerable Bede in England, the most spiritual man of the eighth century, admitted that if a man was not able to execute his penance, another might do it for him. We need no better illustration of how profoundly the principle of solidarity was imbedded in the Mediæval consciousness. It was still another defect in the system that the punishments assigned to offences were of an arbitrary character, not growing directly out of the evil itself; and because they were or seemed arbitrary and external to the soul, the inference was natural that to escape from the punishment was a clear gain. We are studying here the history of ethical culture, where it is as important to note the defects as it is to do justice to the good it may have wrought; and at this point we reach the deepest interest the system possesses. For if humanity appears as submitting to an ethical training from without, it also appears as going through a mighty and prolonged effort to overcome that principle in its moral training which assigned arbitrary penalties as the results of sin.

The first step toward this end was taken by the church itself, when it set forth baptism as the escape from original sin whose consequence was endless punishment. The motive of endless punishment as a deterrent from sin was used so sparingly in the ancient church, and especially by the Greek Fathers, that in many cases it is doubtful whether the doctrine was actually held. It was in the Latin church

that the appeal was taken to it, as by Tertullian and Cyprian, but chiefly by Augustine, to whose powerful personality the doctrine was essential, as the shadow cast by the conviction of the possibilities of an endless life. The experience of Augustine teaches us that the doctrine of endless punishment is the accompaniment of the awakened conscience of the individual; that its force is most strongly felt by one who aspires most deeply after the love of God and union with the divine. The attempt to realize all that salvation means inevitably leads the sensitive soul to forecast the significance of its loss. What otherwise might have been a precarious tenure thus becomes converted into the deeper consciousness of actual irreversible possession. In this aspect of the doctrine can be understood the circumstance that it should be more forcibly urged in those ages or in those institutions where individualism has been predominant, than in the Mediæval church, which was the exponent of solidarity. Very moderate was the employment of this appeal in the Middle Ages, as compared with the Protestant churches where the cultivation of the personality was the predominant aim; and where the doctrines of election and, at a later time, of conversion called upon the individual to sound the lowest depths of his spiritual nature in order to measure his attitude toward God. It was in the monasteries of the Middle Ages, also, that this doctrine of endless punishment became the accompaniment of religious experience rather than in the secular church, where it was reserved for those who defied the church's authority, a terror for the few who were in danger of falling out of the ranks of solidarity within the church, rather than for those who professed submission to its decrees. Hence it did not weigh heavily upon the popular consciousness, where the sense of individual responsibility was weak, and where baptism was regarded as the escape from its operation as an arbitrary divine enactment. It served to intensify the sense of difference between the church and the world outside which lay in darkness — that heathen world doomed to this awful destiny.

Within the Latin church of the Middle Ages purga-

tory was the real source of fear and dread; and human instincts began from an early hour to work for the overthrow of this conception of punishment in so far as it did not grow out of sin by a necessary law, but was regulated by the enactments of the church. Even the system of ecclesiastical discipline here appears as aiding or abetting the popular instinct. As the penalties themselves were arbitrary and external to the soul, so also the relief was alike arbitrary and external which was known as indulgences. The church professed at first to deal only with the temporal penances, imposed by its own authority. If a man was unable to pay, or a lifetime was not sufficient to expiate his offences, the church in her discretion might remit the penalty either in whole or in part. That seemed rational and might be just. The principle was tried on a large scale when the Crusades first began, and its results seemed to justify its adoption.

But the church had not assumed that temporal penalties covered the whole case. There was to be another reckoning with God hereafter, wherein she could not interfere. She could grant absolution, but it was conditional in form, having the efficacy of devout prayer that the sin for which the priest exempted the offender on earth might also be forgiven by God. For the great majority of souls within the church, purgatory was the destination, — a place where venial sins were expiated, a period indefinite in extension, of whose nature there was no attempt at rigid definition, beyond the certainty that its punishments would at some moment come to an end. If humanity had found an escape from endless punishment by methods that seemed arbitrary or external, such as baptism or the doctrine of atonement, there was no reason why some method of escape should not be also devised from the pains of purgatory. These too partook of the same arbitrary character as other punishments; there was no inward necessity why they should not be abridged or averted altogether.

The conviction grew up in the popular mind that the church was equal to the emergency of delivering souls from purgatory. No ecclesiastical council formulated the

principle. It was the mind of Europe, the imagination of a whole people, investing the church with all divine prerogatives. It began to take form at the moment when the church was winning her victories over emperors and princes, when Innocent the Great asserted the authority of the papacy in every country in Europe. The church could not but accept the honor and the power with which she was being clothed anew, adding to her dominion on earth the dominion over heaven. The theological principle by which the penalties of purgatory were to be overcome, was set forth by Thomas Aquinas, and it reflects the inmost life of the Middle Ages,— the principle of solidarity in its final culmination or apotheosis. The members of the church constituted a great whole, they were members of Christ, and therefore of one another; it was therefore possible that the merits of one might be transferred to another, and the deficiencies of some be made good by the redundant virtues of their favored brethren. There were the saints, for example, who had not only fulfilled the church's requirements, but had by their life of painful self-abnegation created a superfluous accumulation of merit for which there was no use unless it could be brought into a general circulation or deposited to the credit of those who had fallen into spiritual poverty or destitution. If this common treasure of human merit was not vast enough to stand the drain upon its resources, when it was thrown open to all, it could be made to expand into infinite resources, because it was unfailingly supplied by the infinite merits of Christ. And this inexhaustible treasury was at the disposal of the church to be distributed at need and according to her discretion. This whole story of indulgences reads like some fairy tale, as if humanity, instead of being spiritually poor and bankrupt, had suddenly become rich beyond the power of the imagination to measure, waking up to find itself the heir of Christ and of the saints. When we are tracing the origin of some of our most cherished convictions, the sacredness, the dignity, the grandeur, the nobility of human nature, — the conception of humanity as an ideal, worth laboring and

suffering for, in the mind of some so glorious as to be a substitute for God, we must revert to this moment in the Middle Ages, when the enthusiasm for humanity, as it were, became the one controlling motive in life, and went beyond the bounds of moderation and discretion.

At the very moment when this exercise of indulgences was producing an unwonted excitement, at the beginning, that is, of the fourteenth century, Dante was writing his *Divine Comedy*. He was in downright opposition to the temper of the age, to the attitude of the church. He met the fate of all those who try to stem the current of a popular conviction. He was showing men that punishments were not arbitrarily assigned by some external authority, but grew out of evil as its inevitable consequence, and the nature of the evil might be seen reflected in the misery which it created. Hell and purgatory and heaven corresponded to an inward condition of the soul. But the age did not heed the teaching of Dante, nor for centuries was that voice from the depth of the Middle Ages to command the audience of the world.

When a man who has been poor suddenly becomes rich, with a wealth allowing the full gratification of his whim or imagination, we are interested in noting whether he will stand the test, in what ways he will proceed to indulge his sense of power. Humanity in the Middle Ages was coming into the supposed possession of spiritual wealth in an inexhaustible treasury, at the same moment when the wealth begotten of trade and commerce was transforming the world. The heavenly and the earthly treasures were placed in competition. The idea of a commutation in money payments, which had always been recognized in the ecclesiastical discipline, now revived with unwonted force. The wealth obtained by industry was turned over into heavenly securities. On the whole, we must admit that humanity behaved with credit to itself; that the vision, before it disappeared, leaving emptiness and bitterness in its stead, does reveal humanity as inclined to respond to ideal ends, as the highest, most characteristic

aim of its existence. There was almost a spiritual panic, as men in their eagerness hastened to take possession of their spiritual treasury. There was, of course, a selfish desire to buy their own pardon, their own deliverance from purgatory; but the strongest motive, the most pathetic aspect of the whole business, was the desire to release their friends, their parents, their wives, their children, from the unknown world of human anguish and suffering.

One may note, in this curious phase of Mediæval religious experience, the common characteristic of all the phases of the deeper life of the Mediæval church. The social aim predominates. The duties of life spring out of our solidarity as a race, duties to the church, to the social order, or to one another. The highest expression of this social aim was seen when the sense of the bond uniting humanity on earth with humanity in the invisible world, led to one great effort to emancipate that part of the race which was suffering in purgatory. It was as though the church on earth led another crusade for the object of recovering the human soul from the sepulchre of terrors in which it was entombed.

It is not necessary to touch upon the evil side of this subject of indulgences. Its history is familiar and needs no fresh exposition. The whole system of ecclesiastical discipline was working badly in the age of the Renaissance. Instead of moral improvement, moral corruption seemed to be its outcome. For two hundred years there went on an increasing protest against the abuses it engendered. But it would be a mistake to think that the discipline had wrought only evil. It was very much with the penitential system of the church as it was with the professions of the monastic life. The monks aimed at poverty and inevitably grew rich; defeating their direct end, no doubt, but yet retaining the perfect ideal of man, as having a real existence apart from the fictitious surroundings of his life. The system of discipline had contributed to the social structure, grounding it in the principle of Christian solidarity. There was vastly more humanity in the Middle Ages, a kindlier relationship and

sense of dependence among classes of society, than in the age which followed.

What, then, was the hidden cause of the abuses, the failures and corruptions, under which the world was laboring and complaining in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, before Luther appeared? It was not altogether that the church had failed to accomplish its mission, but that, by accomplishing its mission, it had brought humanity to a point where the lack of some higher motive was felt than the church could at once supply. It was the work of the German people to supply this motive; they became the bearer of what seemed like a new revelation, in reality the restoration of an older truth, for which, under the imperial régime of Latin Christianity, there had been no place or opportunity. The Germans were called to this task by a divine Providence, so ordering their political history that, when other nations were on the eve of national independence and prosperity, for Germany there was reserved division, defeat, and humiliation. Germany had entered more deeply than any other country in Europe into the Mediæval ideal. Italy itself had not been so overcome by the presence in its midst of the spiritual head of the church, as had Germany by the doctrine of the Holy Roman Empire. It was German emperors, not French or English kings, that had suffered the deepest humiliations at the hands of the papacy. From the time when the Empire lay prostrate, after the last representative of the Hohenstaufen dynasty had died ignominiously on the scaffold, Germany began to turn its attention to the interior life of the soul, in order to find in its inward experience the consolation which it needed. The characteristic movements in Germany in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries are religious, when elsewhere they are political or secular. The most typical German man before Luther appeared was Eckhart, the mystic philosopher; the most typical book was the *Imitation of Christ*, where it is no longer humanity offering consolation or pardon to itself as in priestly absolution, but the voice of God is heard once more, speaking imme-

diately, speaking in the first person, the "I am," in the depth of the soul. These were among the most direct precursors of Luther, to whom he owed most, from whom he borrowed most. Germany more than any other country had exploited the significance of ecclesiastical discipline. Indulgences had found their greatest demand in Germany, their sale had been prolonged there when it was unfruitful elsewhere. But discipline was just that feature of Mediæval Christianity letting us down most deeply into the recesses of spiritual or human experience, the most inward process of the soul. It was concerned with the consciousness of evil, the need of repentance, the desire for pardon; in a word, purification, reconciliation, and everlasting peace. This was the absolute truth also for which Luther was seeking when he entered the monastery of Erfurt.

The highest aims of life are sometimes the unconscious ones. Luther had no other apparent object than to gain what the church had to offer, the same sense of pardon and reconciliation for which the thousands who had preceded him had sought. He was exhausting in the convent cell the resources of the church in ministering to the soul. The inward distress which he experienced, from which he could not escape, was the symbol of a vast and mighty revolution, whose purport he was long in realizing. Humanity, even in its fairest and purest attitude, could not bring relief. He had touched the weak spot in the whole method of Mediæval discipline and education. When, according to the theory, he ought to have been satisfied, he became more profoundly dissatisfied; when he had done all that could be done for reconciliation and pardon, he was further from its attainment than when he began his expiation. His soul was expanding on its Godward side, and the higher he stood, the larger grew the ideal and its obligation, till it seemed to assume infinite proportions. The duty toward man might be approximately felt or fulfilled, it was certainly definite and clear; but the duty toward God knew no limit to its range, to seek for its fulfilment was to forever enlarge its scope. In this emergency of the soul, there was no man that could help him, and even the church had

failed him. There is nothing like this, at once so awful and so sublime, in the history of Christian experience. It was the beginning of a new era, — when one man came forth out of the heart of humanity who was forced to stand alone, who could no longer rely on the solidarity of the race to save him, who in his spiritual isolation confronted the whole world, the Empire as well as the Church, who, when humanity failed him, threw himself upon God, and stood by the strength of a righteousness which was not his own, except in so far as his longing after it made it his own. Such is the principle of individual salvation, the doctrine of justification by faith.

The defect in the statement of Thomas Aquinas, whereby he had justified the doctrine of indulgences, was also the defect of Mediæval ethics and ethical training, the assumption that there was a limit to human obligation, that it was possible for the saint to do all that was required of him. Here lay the source of corruption, which was generating the abuses of the age. It was a check to the advance of humanity, because it gave no room for expansion, reducing life to a dreary, dead monotony. Luther saw that complete fulfilment of human aspiration was not feasible, because man was connected through Christ with a world of infinite possibility. Justification by faith was the only alternative. Peace with God was attained not by fulfilment of obligation, but by aspiration for the divine. The longing after goodness was the ultimate promise of its attainment. To have faith in Christ, was what God demanded, and faith was the germ of the righteousness which justified. Faith brought the soul into union and communion with God in Christ, the highest result which man could achieve on his Godward side.

III

In the complex system of Mediæval discipline, with its adjustments and compromises as developed in the process of time, there may be discerned a twofold tendency and result. In the first place, it had bred a scrupulous anxiety

about personal salvation carrying with it a heavy burden of responsibility, a sense of uncertainty, an inward condition of irritation with the vexatious penitential methods; and all this enhanced by the requirements of the church, which from the thirteenth century made confession to a priest obligatory upon every one who would remain in the fellowship of salvation. But, on the other hand, there kept pace with this system the opposite method, which laid stress upon the *opus operatum* principle in the sacrament of the altar, whose effectiveness, according to the theory, required no effort on the part of the worshipper. Any one might participate in its benefits simply by his presence, by putting no obstacle in the way of its beneficial action. But it was a growing characteristic of the age before the Reformation, that the ritual of the altar was losing its hold upon the reason or its charm for the imagination. The doctrine of transubstantiation, which was the crude Latin equivalent for the subtler view of the Greek Fathers, could no longer justify itself to the awakened mind seeking to escape from dependence on physical methods of realizing a spiritual result. A return to the fundamental principles of the Platonic philosophy was making the presuppositions of Mediæval cultus irrational and impossible.

But the principle of the *opus operatum*, however irrational its presentation in the sacrament of the altar, yet represents the groping after a spiritual truth demanded by the inmost necessities of the religious life. It stands for the conviction that God is responsible for human salvation, that the burden rests primarily upon Him rather than on the individual soul, that He voluntarily assumes the burden and Himself supplies the soul with the food of life; or, as the Psalmist has said of the whole animal creation, "These all seek their meat from God; what thou givest them they gather; thou openest thine hand and they are filled with good"; or, again, the words of Christ, "The birds of the air sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them." At the moment, then, when the Reforma-

tion made its protest against the penitential system of the Roman church, which kept the soul in uncertainty and anxiety about its salvation, burdening it with petty exactions and routine methods; and when also the counteractive principle in the *opus operatum* of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper had lost its force and meaning, Luther came to the rescue with his doctrine of justification by faith only, and Calvin with his doctrine of election by sovereign divine decree, — convictions which alike throw the burden upon God and set man free from the harassing exaction of a diseased and morbid conscience, made diseased by an unnatural effort which was defeating its own end.[1]

It was the standing complaint against the doctrine of justification by faith, even in the age of the Reformation, that it did not call for works, that it tended toward moral laxity or indifference, even if it did not encourage a tendency to sin. The Reformers themselves became sensitive lest the doctrine should be abused and perverted from its true significance. It was also true of the doctrine of election, that it begot the inference that so long as a man was predestined to salvation by the divine will, his own conduct could not affect the result whether it were good or bad. But the same objections applied with even greater force to the prevailing view of the sacrament of

[1] For Luther's doctrine of justification by faith, cf. his earlier treatises, in the years immediately following the posting of the Theses: *An den christl. Adel deutscher Nation; De Captivitate Babylonica Ecclesiae;* and *Von der Freiheit eines Christenmannes*, in *Werke*, ed. Walch; also his *Tischreden*, ed. Förstemann and Bindseil; where one gets the setting of the doctrine in its more flexible forms. Cf. also Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, III., pp. 691 ff.; Dorner, *His. of Prot. Theol.*, Vol. I.; Müller, *Symbolik. Vergleichende Darstellung der christlichen Hauptkirchen nach ihren Grundzüge und ihren wesentlichen Lebensäusserernngen.* Among the lives of Luther, Köstlin, *Martin Luther's Leben u. s. Schriften.* Among the best English estimates of Luther are essays by Tulloch in *Leaders of the Reformation;* Carlyle in *Heroes and Hero Worship;* and Froude in *Short Studies.* The best English life is by Beard. Luther kept himself apart from the humanists, but they welcomed his appearance and his teaching — a prophecy of the destiny of his doctrine of justification, when it should be appropriated by the transcendental school in philosophy, and made the ruling principle in ethical culture.

the altar, that faith was not necessary to its participation, that even the wicked man received the body of Christ, and pressed it with his teeth, no less than the faithful soul, whose gaze was fixed on Christ.

All the Protestant churches in the Reformation, Lutheran, Anglican, and Calvinist, made their protest against the sacerdotal discipline of the Middle Ages, rejecting its principle and its method. They would fain, indeed, out of the force of long association, have retained some reminiscence of its operation, but it was feeble and soon vanished. In the Reformed Church, another form of discipline had been substituted, which Calvin had drawn in its leading outline at Geneva. The Calvinists had not reacted so much against discipline in itself, as against the sacerdotal method of the Middle Ages. It lingered longer in the Reformed Church, where, however, it was not sacerdotal but the self-discipline of the congregation; even there also it was doomed to vanish as incongruous with higher methods for the cultivation of the spiritual life. But in the Anglican and Lutheran churches no substitute had been provided, and the idea of a discipline of the laity at the hands of the clergy disappeared. It was not in keeping with the spirit of individual emancipation and freedom, the liberty of the children of God, into which the Reformation ushered the modern world. But it must be borne in mind that the penitential system did not disappear until the modern state had arisen, and regained the functions of which it had been deprived by the imperial church. The state now takes cognizance of those sins injurious to the social order or hindering its free development, which it once fell to the priesthood to punish in the confessional. Marriage, confessedly one of the most difficult of social problems, has now become a civil rite, without losing its religious character in the eyes of the church. Education, upon which the well-being of the state depends, is now in the control of the state, as it should be, and no longer the exclusive prerogative of the clergy. There are moments when the church feels that the state may not be fulfilling its moral functions to the best advan-

tage, but the remedy does not lie in a return to Mediæval methods, but rather in bringing the force of religious ideals to bear upon the state, in order to the clearer recognition and the better exemplification of its ethical purpose.

The religious world which the Reformation expanded and elevated is the richer for the variations displayed by the churches in their ethical modes and standards. For these variations were of deep significance, as is also the common unity which underlies them. The Lutheran principle was justification by faith; the Calvinistic idea was God's decree. While the former accepted the doctrine of election, yet it did not place upon it an equal emphasis; and while Calvin held firmly to justification, yet it was in some different way from Luther, so that justification by faith has never been to the Reformed Church what it has been to the Germans. The Church of England, as became a comprehensive church for the nation, gave an equal place to both tenets, incorporating them into her Articles of Religion. But neither of these principles has furnished the exclusive inspiration for faith and morals in the Anglican church. It has given, in practice, a greater prominence to the method of religious nurture in the Book of Common Prayer, which, placed as it is in the hands of every member of the church from childhood to age, as though it possessed equal authority with Scripture, tends to build up the institution of the church and magnify its importance, while beneath its use lies another conception of the principle involved in justification by faith and in election, — the great doctrine of the priesthood of all Christians. By this one effective act, the Church of England elevated the laity to an equality with the clergy. In successive Acts of Parliament enforcing the use of the Prayer Book by the will of the nation, was cemented the alliance between church and state, wherein the church has continued to minister to England's power and greatness.

In the Reformed Church the doctrine of election has ministered in another way to human civilization. It has been a levelling force, by which social distinctions and the pride of caste have been overcome. All men stand alike

before God, in virtue of a principle taking precedence of every other, that human salvation is the direct immediate work of God. In its first working, when this principle is to be seen to best advantage, it was an invitation to men to rise from the humiliation of human tyrannies, to go forth free from an ecclesiastical discipline which hampered and belittled the soul; it was an offer of escape from the anxiety and uncertainty about one's spiritual condition, whereby men were kept in bondage to an ecclesiastical hierarchy. All this was accomplished by the conviction which had long been growing, the most popular conviction in the age of the Reformation, that God Himself and He alone was responsible for eternal destinies. The call that came to man was to gird himself for the accomplishment of the divine will in this present world. Too long had the world been gazing at unreality, preoccupied with a ritual whose splendors were an anticipation of a world to come, but seducing men into a mood of indifference or inaction, when gigantic evils were calling for redress.

The Reformed Church differed from the Lutheran in the manifestation of a deep-seated antagonism to Mediæval ritual, while the German church was primarily a protest against the spirit and the method of Mediæval discipline. Both motives in the Anglican church were subordinated to nationality. While all three of these movements accepted the doctrine of a personal election, and thus threw back upon God the responsibility for man, it was the Reformed Church which made this conviction its one supreme controlling motive. If in later times this motive has been so conceived or perverted as to reverse its original purpose, yet it may still be contemplated, in its first acceptation, when in the age of the Reformation it became the signal of revolt against the imprisonment of man whom God had predestined to spiritual freedom and to the enforcement of His will in human society. The Reformed Church resembled the Latin church in assuming a cosmopolitan character, which made it at home in every land. It subordinated nationality, and the subjective aspirations of the soul, to a

divine objective call to subdue human opposition to the divine will. It is seen in its most distinctive aspect when engaged in this task, whether at Geneva or in the Netherlands, in France, in Scotland, or the Puritan struggle in England. It was capable of affiliation with the national purpose, as in the Netherlands or in Scotland; but under this coalition it tended to change its character, and to assume the more moderate comprehensive mood of a national church. But, as it is revealed in history, the Reformed Church has not, like the Anglican, promoted and consolidated a powerful and dominant nationality. It has also met with a check in its inherent tendency to produce sects and divisions, as has not been true of Anglicanism or Lutheranism, more closely identified as they have been with national interests. But beneath all its divisions, however diverse, there still runs the same undercurrent of conviction, which in times of quiet and repose turns inward and produces the storms and the conflicts of religious experience. Yet it only slumbers and waits for its opportunity to manifest itself anew in its original form, when methods of discipline that the human will may devise, threaten to defeat the plan of the divine discipline or nullify the calling and the vocation of God.

The doctrine of justification by faith has found its fullest exposition in the land which gave it birth. The organization of the German church may seem inferior when compared with the organization of the Church of England, or with the system of government which Calvin set forth as having the warrant of divine authority. There were obstacles in Germany to the free exercise of gifts of administration which did not exist so powerfully elsewhere. The organization of the German church seems too much like a makeshift adopted in haste, or bent to the conditions of necessity or expediency — some temporary arrangement until a more perfect order could be had. But Luther did not possess the organizing genius of Calvin, nor was he chiefly interested in matters of administration. As in the arrangement of the cultus, he was indifferent to the form; for his assurance was strong that the doctrine of justifica-

tion, if it could be implanted in the heart of the people, would be the germ of a life which would clothe itself with an expressive manifestation. It may be, however, that this doctrine does not lend itself easily or naturally to the purposes of an institution. It still remains what it was when it first took shape in Luther's soul, the last refuge of the individual soul, the hope and the inspiration of man in his deepest moods, the highest consolation in life, and the surest support in the hour of death. In this respect Luther stands as a type of the German people, giving expression to its inmost soul. "There has never been a German," said Döllinger, "who so intuitively understood his fellow-countrymen, and who in return has been so thoroughly understood, nay, I should say has been so completely imbibed by his nation, as this Augustinian friar of Wittenberg. The mind and the spirit of the Germans were under his control like the lyre in the hands of a musician."

But if the Germans have not built up a great institution as the expression of their religious life, on the other hand they have not been dominated by one to the limitation or suppression of individual freedom. In England there was a tendency to repress religious freedom, as under the Tudors and the Stuarts, except in so far as it accorded with the interests of national policy. Those who were in sympathy with this policy were free, but for those who were not, it seemed like a worse tyranny than papal authority. But in Germany, where political or national freedom was sacrificed through exigencies which could not be escaped, religious freedom was secured to a greater degree than elsewhere in Christendom. No imposing institution, like the national Church of England, intimidated, with its prestige or splendor, the consciousness of the German people. Luther was greater than any organization which the Germans could construct. In accepting his principle of "private judgment," which is the inevitable deduction from the premisses of justification by faith, the Germans have exemplified the value of individual freedom, in ways which have made the religious world their debtor.

Private judgment is but another name, perhaps not the best one, for that process which Luther went through in the monastery, when he felt the force of Christian history entering his soul, and leaving its stamp upon his personality. Most men are content to leave the concerns of the soul to be managed for them by others; to give their assent to what is declared by some supposed competent authority to be true, or withhold their assent, if it pleases them to do so. But Luther was not content with the acknowledgment of the facts of Christian history, as imparted by catechetical instruction, but was bent upon the process of interpreting those facts, till he read in them their deepest response to his own personal needs. He entered into the experience of humanity, making it his own, and was thus prepared to state what he believed. Thus he came to the truth for himself. Such a process had not been seen, in such completeness, since St. Paul made the transition from Judaism to the Christian church. Personal conviction, which is only another name for private judgment, does not mean that a man picks and chooses what he likes from the treasure house of Christian faith and tradition, but that he allows the stream of human experience to flow through his soul and to produce its legitimate result. This inwardness, this force of conviction, has been the mark of German thought and of German religion, as it has not been, to an equal extent, of any other church or people. Luther stands for the principle that each man must find out the truth for himself, if so be that he feels himself called to the endless search; and his disciples have illustrated the depth, the extent, the exhaustiveness, of the process required to this end. If a man would know, in the fullest sense of knowledge, what it is that he believes, he must know what the church has believed in every age, and the ground on which its belief has rested.

To read the history of the past is to study one's own inward and possible experience. The thinkers and the scholars of Germany have not been untrue to the method of their leader. Failures are to be expected in such a method, but they contribute in the long process to the end

to be achieved. Schleiermacher and Neander, Gieseler, Rothe, Dorner and Baur, Ritschl, Harnack or Wellhausen, these in theology; Leibniz and Kant, Hegel and Lotze, and many others in philosophy; even Goethe in the realm of purely human culture, are alike disciples of the monk of Wittenberg. The principle of modern philosophy, that the world of event or thought or experience must be brought to a focus in the individual consciousness, as the ground of reality and truth, is, after all, but the confirmation of Luther's struggle in his cell at Erfurt, when he was wrestling with Mediæval discipline, and demonstrated its inadequacy as the method for training the human soul. Whatever may be the deficiencies of the German church as an institution meeting the people's need, yet it has had its mission and its compensation in the contribution it has made to the universal welfare of humanity. Some influence still clings to Germany, an inheritance, it may be, from the days of Mediæval imperialism when she was allied with the papacy, leading her to seek after universal ends and impelling the individual to expand himself, if he would achieve his freedom, to the measure and the standard of the race of man.

Luther rejected the Mediæval discipline, with its sacerdotal directorship for the soul, in order to set man free for the fulfilment of his duty toward God. But to define what this relationship toward God requires is beyond the power of reason or imagination. The soul is in danger of losing itself in the infinite expanse, when God is taken into the calculation of human obligation and responsibility. But from this obligation there is no escape by seeking again to find satisfaction in the apparently simpler task of the duty toward man; for human relationships have their Godward aspect and their infinite outlook. The mystics were not far from the truth when they felt that they knew God better than they knew themselves; when they argued from God to man, as from the known to the unknown. What God requires, as Eckhart thought, is only that the soul should open itself to receive Him, the sacramental passivity which imposes no bar to the divine activity. The

ideal of a Christian man in his freedom, as Luther conceived it, demands the adjustment of the duty toward God with the duty toward man:

"I say, therefore, that neither pope, nor bishop, nor any man, has the right of imposing a single syllable upon a Christian man, unless it be done by his own consent; and whatever is done otherwise is done in the spirit of tyranny."

But he recognizes another aspect of Christian freedom:

"A Christian man is a free Lord over all things and subject to no one, and a Christian man is a ministering servant of all things and subject to every one. On the one hand, he has the perfect freedom of a king and priest set over all outward things; but, on the other hand, he yields complete submission in love to his neighbor, which as consideration of the weak his very freedom demands."

All this is good and true, and, though indefinite, is still a formula for the solution of the problem that demands the reconciliation between the duty toward God and the duty toward man. The Latin church had constituted its discipline mainly with reference to the fulfilment of those duties involved in the relationship of men with each other in the social order. That social order had then taken shape as the Roman church, with the papacy as its head; and to this social organization even the duty toward God was regarded as subordinate. From this point of view, the sin of heresy was the deadliest sin, because it endangered the existence of this social order. The Latin church had recognized a certain qualified escape from a social pressure which would have annihilated individual freedom, by the constitution of the monastery, where the duty toward God of self-cultivation in its higher reaches, as they were then conceived, might be realized. In the age of the Renaissance, the expansion of the individual ideal had become so vast and so multiplex, that the monastery was outgrown and cast aside as an inadequate provision rather hampering than helping a man in the fulfilment of his duty toward God. For the duty toward God demands the absolute freedom of the individual in order to the obedience of his divine vocation, the recognition of the call which comes

to every man's conscience to develop to the utmost the gifts with which God has endowed him. In poetry, in art, in the rising science, in philosophy, and in literature, in statecraft, in trade and commerce, there were openings for the individual vocation, which had hitherto been unknown. The revelation of man to himself has been ever since the ruling idea of the modern world, with a richness and glory of manifestation it is impossible to enumerate or describe, in comparison with which the ages that go before seem empty and barren. The doctrine of justification by faith has been not only the basis of the modern religious life, but it has been translated into a larger formula enveloping every vocation in life with a divine halo in so far as it is fulfilled in a spirit of sincerity and of devotion to ideal ends.

But in our own age, there has risen a social ideal whose form is yet indeterminate, which, like the Mediæval order, threatens individual freedom under the specious pretexts of emancipation from the burdens of personality or of false economic systems. Under its prevalence, the belief in a personal God and the sense of personal immortality would be weakened, as also the recognition of the duty toward God. The possession of wealth and its employment for ideal ends, apart from purely social obligations, is regarded with jealousy and suspicion. There exists an uneasy consciousness, as though the duty toward man now called for the sacrifice of the duty toward God. Self-culture, whether intellectual or æsthetic, is for the moment hindered or embarrassed, or pursued with a sense of inward contradiction. The joyousness of an inward freedom is giving way to inward confusion and to vague fears, incompatible with the highest individual development. A similar mood found expression in Walther von der Vogelweide, who died in 1230, on the eve of the transition to a higher order; of whom it was said that he knew above all others to give the fittest word for the movements of the German spirit. At that moment when the old order was drawing to a close he was communing deeply with his own heart: "Anxiously did I consider with myself how one ought to live in this world. But no

advice was I able to obtain, how one should appropriate to himself three things, in order that he should possess the fulness of his power. Two of these things are honor and wealth, which often do injury to each other. The third is God's grace, worth more than the other two. These three things I would fain have as my own within a shrine. But alas! it cannot be that riches and honor and the grace of God should come together in a single life."

There is danger to-day lest ecclesiastical organizations should stand in the way of the divinely ordered development of the individual man. Among those who would fain pursue a divine call to the utmost bounds, there is a fear lest the church should hamper freedom and restrict opportunities until a man should be less a man within its fold than if he maintained himself outside its range. But the ecclesiastical attitude, which is restricting the divine within too narrow limits, is a temporary mood. The social development also must grant individual opportunity, unless it would become a tyranny worse than that from which Luther suffered, and escaped by the doctrine of justification by faith. In the confusion of the moment, amid the groping and the uncertainty, the vague desires that can fasten on no adequate ideal, it is something to recall the story of Luther, in whose experience is somehow revealed the secret of life. He has presented an ethical no less than a religious ideal, which is no abstraction, wherein we believe, even if we cannot describe or define. Humanity must realize its destiny in relationship with nature and with society on the one hand, and with God on the other. The obligations by which the individual life is perfected may take shape in plain and simple duties to our fellows, but they stretch away into the infinite, including the true, the good, and the beautiful, when we consider our duty toward God. In escaping from the horrors of his prison house at Erfurt, Luther has emancipated us from our narrowness, our seclusion, our petty fears. Henceforth we should have the courage to stand with firmer feet upon God's earth, realizing ourselves and the divine endowment of our human nature.

The history of the human race from the ethical point of view assumes a discouraging aspect, if judged alone by the results that have been accomplished. It is true of humanity as a whole, as it is of the individual, that it is justified by faith only. The goal of perfection is in the remote future, so distant that it is almost lost to our view. If we condemn human order or society too strongly in the unreformed period of Christian history, bringing into the unrelieved light the hideous picture of its abuses, the same method, when applied to our modern civilization, reveals the failure to redress great evils or attain the highest good. It is desirable to show, if it can be shown, that the human race has never at any moment altogether wasted its time. If the progress has been slow, it has been real. If we are discouraged when we consider the time it has required to take even one short step in advance, the remedy for the depression is to dwell on the persistency of the ideal and its expansion, as the sign of a progress which can be measured in no other way.

The truth that we are justified by faith is then the deep inward principle of the spiritual life and the ground of Christian hope, whether for ourselves or others. It is because it lies so deep beneath the surface of our ordinary consciousness, not because it is denied or underrated, that its proclamation is so rarely heard in formal manner. It is only in great crises of history that it emerges into dogmatic affirmation; twice only in the history of the Christian church that the appeal has been taken to it in order to new and higher stages of human development, — those moments which produced St. Paul and Martin Luther. The one opened the doors of the church to the Gentile world, and undid Jewish legalism; the other, alone and single-handed, resisted the most powerful religious organization the world has ever seen, and led forth the people who were able to follow. Both of them underwent a trial of religious experience threatening to rend their inmost being, before they struggled out of darkness into light, the sword piercing their hearts, that the thought of many hearts might be revealed.

In the final test of things, the last solitary tribunal of the soul, the man who has known Christ, as God has revealed Him, cannot fall back upon what he has actually accomplished as his justification before God. It is not by works of righteousness which we have done. That which has been achieved is so slight, compared with that which ought to have been or might have been, that in the self-review it almost disappears. Have we grown better, have we made progress, can we measure the progress in moral attainment by any practical, trustworthy standards, has the world progressed, and, if so, what are the tests by which we judge, what is meant by this perpetual self-accusation of failures and transgressions of which we are conscious, how much has the world itself accomplished in comparison with evils yet remaining to be overcome, — when we ask these questions, in deep and sad sincerity, there is but one answer, but one consolation: if we have not succeeded in doing much, yet we have not lowered the ideal or been recreant to the heavenly vision. Notwithstanding the failure or the lapse, wilful or unconscious, it is much to be able to say, "I have loved righteousness and hated iniquity." Hildebrand and Luther here stand upon a common ground. The most that the individual man or the race can offer before God as an acceptable sacrifice, is not works that have been done, but Christ, the inspirer and finisher of our faith. When the fight has been fought and the course has been run, this is the only justification for saint or for sinner, for humanity as a whole, or individual man, that Christ has never been disowned, — the confession of St. Paul, I have kept the faith.

The sense of personal responsibility, if unrelieved, might become a burden too heavy to bear. This sense and this burden have grown out of the doctrine of baptism, out of catechetical instruction, penitential books, systems of discipline, a compulsory confessional, and modes of penance and absolution. The Mediæval church lightened the burden with the doctrine of the *opus operatum* in the sacrament of the altar. When that failed, Luther proposed the principle of justification by faith; Calvin and his disciples found com-

fort in the divine decree of election by which God assumed the responsibility of human salvation; of which it is said, in Article XVII. of the Thirty-nine Articles, that it is full of "sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort" to such as rightfully receive it. The formulas of the Reformation may have fallen into disuse, but their spirit remains, and has at last found its supreme and final utterance in the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God.

CHAPTER II

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRINCIPLES WHICH AFFECTED THE CULTUS

In the history of the Christian cultus or worship may be traced the same line of cleavage which runs through the history of ecclesiastical organization or through the development of Christian doctrine. The contrast between administration and prophecy, the episcopate and monasticism, the interests of the "secular" as contrasted with the "religious" aspects of the church, the Catholic creeds and the large systems of theological thought developed in the monastery and assuming expression in the expanded confessions of the Reformation age, — this same contrast manifests itself in the sphere of the worship. The prevailing tendency in the cultus of the first three centuries was homiletic or intellectual, appealing to the conscience and the reason; while the disposition which asserts the essential importance of the physical symbols and which found its supreme expression in the Eucharist was held in abeyance. In the ancient church, it was the boast of the Apologists that there was neither temple nor sacrifice nor altar, but a spiritual worship consisting in the offering of a grateful heart to a purely spiritual being, of whom no image could be framed. After the fourth century this order was reversed, the material symbols assumed the predominance, the homiletic service was discontinued in the parish churches as a distinct form of public worship; the Eucharist became the sole embodiment of the Christian aspiration for union and communion with God.

The monasteries of the Middle Ages were characterized by a distinctive worship of their own, no less than by a peculiar and independent organization. They took up the

homiletic service of prayer and praise and of preaching or exhortation, developing its features into a system rich and minute in its details, the intellectual or ethical element still retaining the predominance; while in the secular church, the sacrament of the altar was clothed with all the accessories of beauty and splendor and dramatic power which the Christian imagination could devise. Both aspects of the worship appear in a certain organic relationship in the Middle Ages; the monastery accepted the secular cultus, while the homiletic worship was recognized in varying degrees by the secular clergy. But this adjustment did not obscure the distinction between these divergent aspects of Christian worship.

The Eastern church, as compared with the Latin, gave a fuller development to the sacrament of the altar. While the Latin church was struggling in the throes of the barbarian invasion, wrestling with the issues born of the Augustinian theology, or fulfilling the task of converting the new peoples to the Christian faith, the Oriental church, supported by a stable government, was devoting itself to formularizing the principles of sacramental worship, grounding them in a nature-philosophy which would give consistency and unity to the mysteries of the cultus. No such task was undertaken by the Latin church, nor would it have been wholly congenial to the spirit of the West. The doctrine of transubstantiation was indeed appropriated from the Orient, but after a mode differing from the Oriental interpretation, diverging from it so widely, indeed, as to be almost a Latin creation, when it took its final shape in the Fourth Lateran Council (1215). It was a characteristic of the Eastern church that the nature-philosophy which underlay the development of the Christian Mysteries, was acceptable to the Oriental church, as the inmost expression of the Oriental temperament. But when in the ninth century the doctrine of transubstantiation first gained formal expression in the Western church, it encountered strong and intelligent opposition at the court of Charles the Bald. The treatise of Ratramnus, *On the Body and the Blood of the Lord*, written at the request of the Emperor

in order to combat the obnoxious teaching of transubstantiation first propounded by Radbertus, still remains, after centuries of discussion, a classic on the subject of the Eucharist.[1] Opposition to the doctrine of transubstantiation was again made by Bérenger, a monk in the eleventh century, who agreed with Ratramnus in denying that any change was effected in the elements of bread and wine and in asserting that Christ is spiritually present to the believer only and received into the soul by faith. With this view, Hildebrand, the reigning pope, was in sympathy. These typical protests are sufficient to show that the mind of the Latin church was divided, even in the Middle Ages; while in the East no opposition was raised to the teaching of nature-philosophy that physical elements may be transmuted into spiritual potencies.

This divergence in the inmost consciousness of the Latin church, even in the age of its supremacy, was not overcome by the later mysticism, which sought to interpret the dogma of transubstantiation in harmony with the demands of reason or to reconcile it with spiritual aspirations after inward communion with God. In the age preceding the Reformation, the doctrine was either denied, or else relegated to the sphere of an exoteric worship, symbolic of some higher truth. In the age of the Reformation it was condemned and rejected as false to the reason and to the Word of God, in all the Protestant churches. The revolution then accomplished in the cultus was deeper and more extensive than any changes in organization. The

[1] Cf. Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, Vol. CXXI. This treatise has been often translated. In the tenth century, its substance was worked up into a homily by Ælfric, Archbishop of Canterbury (995–1005), which was set forth by authority "to be spoken unto the people at Easter before they should receive the Communion." It was reissued by Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, with the title, "The Sermon of the Paschal Lambe." The original treatise of Ratramnus (Bertram) was studied by Ridley and Cranmer, and through them has passed over into the communion office of the Church of England. It was the teaching of Ratramnus that the body of Christ in the Eucharist was not the body which was born of Mary, that no change took place in the elements in consequence of consecration, but in a spiritual sense they become, by means of the faith of the recipient, the body and the blood of Christ.

accretions of religious symbolism from the fifth century, together with the philosophy which inspired them, had lost their meaning and their attraction. The worship of the saints and their invocation was forbidden; images and relics were cast forth from the sanctuaries; the cultus of the Virgin Mother, the stimulus to the most enthusiastic devotion of the Middle Ages, was abandoned; the sacramental principle was restated in a spiritual form which nullified the tendency to regard physical acts as in themselves possessing spiritual validity. The church of the first three centuries, neglected and almost forgotten in the long régime of the sacramental and sacerdotal theologies, then became the court of final appeal and a higher standard for worship, when as yet there was no priesthood or altar or sacrifice, in the sense those words had carried in the Latin church. The homiletic service regained its ascendency and the Eucharist was restored to its early simplicity. Any attempt to penetrate into the inner meaning of the Christian cultus must take into account these revolutions in its history.

I

It has been generally assumed that the change in the nature of Christian worship, by which it assumed what is called a magical character, and of which there are intimations in the early church before the fully developed system appeared, was effected under the influence of motives derived from a heathen source. Illustrations have been multiplied from pagan ritual that reveal a close and striking affinity with the later Christian Mysteries. But it cannot be proved that there was any conscious purpose to imitate or reproduce the heathen worship. The similarity, so apparent in the prolonged fastings, the purifications, the lustrations, the special dress, the efficacy of outward acts for spiritual ends, the religious enthusiasm and sensuous forms of devotion, and at a later time the lights and the incense,—these admitted resemblances to heathen worship need not and indeed

cannot have been the result of intentional imitation, nor has it yet been possible to trace the imitation to any one particular Mystery among the many forms of heathen cults. The feeling of antagonism to heathen mythology was too strong to allow of conscious imitation. But it must be admitted that converts from heathenism, fresh from the moral or spiritual influence exercised by the heathen Mysteries, may have brought with them a tendency to translate Christian rites into heathen equivalents, as also that certain writers may have employed the terminology of the Mysteries in describing the significance of Christian ceremonies.[1] The explanation of the change which took place in Christian worship is not to be found so much in tracing points of affinity between Christian and pagan ritual as in the search for some principle common to both alike, some deeper and widely prevailing tendency whence the later Christian Mysteries were developed as they appear after the latter part of the fourth century; a tendency which in the pre-Christian age had given birth to the heathen Mysteries.[2]

From its first appearance in the world, the Christian church could not escape the influence of ruling ideas begotten in the great cycles of human thought. Beneath the life of every age there flows a stream of tendency modifying the currents of human existence, creating also counter currents, so that opposite and contrasted movements may have a common source. The strongest motive in the first formative period of Christianity proceeded

[1] "Crowds were pressing into the church, mostly ignorant and undisciplined, some rich and wilful. They brought with them the moral taint, the ingrained prejudices of their old life. We learn from many sources that the same incongruous blending of the Gospel with pagan superstitions, which recurred during the conversion of the Northern barbarians, existed in some degree in the second and third centuries" (Bigg, *Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, p. 84).

[2] For a valuable discussion of the ancient Mysteries and their connection with Christianity, cf. Anrich, *Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum*, who dismisses the view as untenable, that there was intentional borrowing from heathen sources, or an adaptation to heathen usages, as the origin or explanation of the Christian rites.

from the influence of Plato, whose contribution to religious history lies to a large extent in the attitude he assumed toward the generating principle of the nature-religions. These religions had indeed been weakened by the conquests of the Roman Empire, for they were national religions with local deities; and when these deities were proved too weak to defend their respective territories against the might of Roman arms and Roman gods, they lost prestige and were discredited in the estimation of their worshippers. But previous to the Roman conquests, the process of disintegration had begun, destroying faith in the conviction out of which the nature-worships had proceeded. The nature-religions rested upon the belief that the world was good, that a divine life permeated the visible universe, wherein man also shared. In this common divine life Deity, humanity, and outward visible things were commingled together in one organic whole. Hence had followed the deification of the forces of nature, as so many impersonations of the divine life. Upon this principle were built up the ancient mythologies in which the processes of nature were objects of human worship. But these religions were weak in that they failed to develop the sense of personality in man or to constitute a foundation for the moral life. They had been supplemented by the so-called Mysteries, where the effort was made, in some of them at least, to find in nature the confirmations of man's immortality, or to banish the dark fears which made the future life unenviable and unattractive.

The aim of Plato had been to call attention away from nature, as no longer the source of the highest revelation, and to turn man's thought within, to the study of himself. It is significant that Socrates should have been put to death for disturbing the people's confidence in its religion. The accusation goes to the heart of the Socratic philosophy. Socrates, as it has been said, was not one who learned anything from trees or fields, or the beauty and order of this visible world. He had not, indeed, wholly abandoned the popular religion, but he was emancipating himself

from its inward motive, from that pantheistic conception of nature in which Deity and humanity commingle with nature as forms alike of one common divine principle. He was bent on self-knowledge as the true aim of human learning, and the study of nature was useless because it did not help a man to become more intelligent or more virtuous. Plato therefore stands for the beginning of a new departure in human thought: the study of the inner life of man, the development of the consciousness of selfhood which distinguishes and separates man from his environment in the physical order. Plato affirmed a deep kinship between God and man, but in the life of nature as distinct from man, like Socrates, he had little interest; the natural sciences languished wherever his influence was felt. It was part of the teaching of Plato that in matter, or in the substance of which the visible world was composed, lay the source of misery and evil. But such a doctrine tended to kill the conviction that the world was good, and to destroy faith in the visible world as the manifestation of the divine.

This tendency, inherited from Plato, was an accumulating force, gathering volume from many tributaries in the human consciousness, until it may be said to have culminated in the second century of the Christian era. Persian dualism contributed its quota to this stream of tendency which was developing in man the sense of evil in himself and in outward nature. The remoter influence of Buddhism may possibly be detected also, wherein nature was regarded as unmixed evil and religion was designed to afford escape from its control. The influence of the Platonic philosophy tended to deepen the self-consciousness in man by its introversive method, till the only relief from the sense of evil within or without was in looking away from this world to another where the spiritual ideal reigned supreme, unhindered in its manifestation by the grossness of matter, which in this lower world choked its full expression. There followed a disenchantment in the human spirit with its visible abode, and the happy life with its unconsciousness of self, whose embodiment

had been the glory of ancient art, disappeared, never again to be entirely restored.

The most important feature of the early Christian speculative thought was the Gnostic teaching, by which matter was regarded as the source of evil and the outward world anathematized as an evil thing. The most typical heresy was Docetism, the assertion that Christ did not possess a human body. The Gnostic philosophy was a representative movement, whose teachers were unanimous in holding that the physical, visible world was too evil and the human body too gross to be the creation of God, or fit for His indwelling. The truly divine could not come in contact with matter without suffering degradation. Gnosticism was at its height in the second century, to be followed in the third century by a kindred movement known as Manichæanism, which, while in its origin a nature-religion, was working at the same problem, the disentanglement of man from the impurity of life involved in the natural order. Salvation, in both the Gnostic and Manichæan systems, was an ascetic process aiming at the deliverance of the soul from the bondage of matter, by abstention from those relationships of life in which the tie was close between the spiritual and the physical.

Gnosticism and Manichæanism mark the extreme limit of the movement whose object was to depreciate nature in order to the elevation of man. So far had this movement gone in the direction of criticism and dissolution of old religion, that a prevailing scepticism was a characteristic of the age in which Christianity appeared. But at the moment when the decline of religious faith reached its lowest point, when the mythologies had fallen into discredit with intelligent heathens, at this same moment may be traced the beginning of a reaction on the part of the depressed and dying nature-worships. The reaction is seen in the first century, revealing itself in a religious unrest and dissatisfaction, that sought relief in the restoration of the principle of a divine life in nature, whereby body and soul, the spirit and its material abode, stood in organic relationship to each other. The influence of

the reaction was more clearly manifest in the middle of the second century, the moment when Gnosticism was also at its height, when the evil influences springing from what seemed like an ultra-spiritualism threatened the disintegration of the social order, no less than the destruction of the hopes and the happiness of man in this lower world. It is this conflict between such extreme antagonistic attitudes which, while it confuses the mind seeking to trace the development of Christian institutions, is yet the source of light amidst the confusion, and explains the contradictions of the age. In this struggle the sympathy of the church was divided, but, on the whole, the spiritual movement initiated by Plato predominated in Christian doctrine and in Christian worship, until the middle of the fourth century.

II

The beginning of the reaction, which involved in its fortunes Greek philosophy no less than Christian theology, may be traced in the popular demand during the second century for the nature-worships of the East.[1] Egypt sent forth the veiled Isis on her travels, whose cult spread widely and rapidly throughout the Empire. The worship of the Great Mother, a Phrygian deity, became so popular that she was assigned a place among the national deities of Rome. Baal and Astarte also came to this solemn assembly of gods who were repairing their injured reputations; the Dea Syra and El-gabal, whom Roman emperors received into the highest honors. The worship of Mithras, in which the Sun was adored as the source of a divine

[1] Cf. *Apologies* in early Christian literature, especially the writings of Clement of Alexandria; Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride;* Réville, *La Religion à Rome sous le Sévères;* Boissier, *La Religion Romaine d'Auguste aux Antonins;* Lenormant, *Recherches Archéologiques à Eleusis,* and in *Mémoires de l'Acad. des Inscriptions,* 1861; Cox, *Mythology of the Aryan People;* Brown, *Dionysiak Myth.;* Lajarde, *Recherches sur le Culte de Mithras;* Hatch, *The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages;* Alden, *God in His World.* See also Döllinger, *The Gentile and the Jew;* Preller, *Romische Mythologie;* Keim, *Rom und das Christenthum;* Tylor, *Primitive Culture.*

light, surpassed all other natural cults in the splendor of its ceremonials. These all had their priesthoods with their gorgeous vestments, their rituals and their festival days; nor were they, some of them at least, without a moral purpose, as revealed in exercises for the purification of the worshipper. The scepticism about the gods, that had marked the early years of the Empire, gave way to an excess of religious sentiment, to what is known as superstition; reason became subordinate to instinct, or took refuge in a vague, mysterious naturalism.

It seems irrational that men should have returned to the discarded superstitions of the nature-worships, until we recognize that in this widespread movement there was an almost frantic attempt to retain a conviction of the goodness of Deity, as it was revealed in the external world. Spiritual religion was insufficient, so long as it was indifferent to visible nature, nor could it maintain itself while it anathematized the physical order as evil, or refused to recognize the creation as divine. There are signs of the influence of this reaction within the church also, where God had been defined as spirit, to be known only by the spirit in man. In the growing importance attached in the ante-Nicene age to physical acts, such as the magical efficacy of the water in baptism, the material elements in the Lord's supper, or the sign of the cross made upon the body; in the high estimation assigned to the ecclesiastical organization now passing over into a priesthood that should rival and surpass in its mystic endowments the priesthood of natural religion, — in these are symptoms of a blind desire to counterbalance the onesidedness of spiritual religion as it appeared in the Montanist sect, or in the teaching of Gnostic theologians who resolved Christianity into a school of thought. Even those who, like Tertullian, carried the exclusively spiritual to its furthest consequences, attempted to right themselves by the assertion of the sacredness of matter or of the divine power inhering therein, by which it might become the bearer to the soul of spiritual gifts. The doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh, advocated by Tertullian with such ear-

nestness and even vehemence, was the growing symptom of an impending change whose aim was to restore to humanity some divine gift of which it had been robbed. The world was unwilling to believe that the natural order of the universe was evil, the work of malignant demons, or that it was doomed to destruction by fire, as philosophers and theologians had taught. The most irrational superstitions of the nature-worship awakened a response in those who shrank from this cold and hopeless negation.

In the earliest form of Christian literature, known as the Apologies, the Christian Fathers were not only defending the church against the misunderstandings or the malicious accusations of heathenism; not only were they maintaining Christian principles and setting forth rational and consistent statements of Christian truth, which, supported as they were by the employment of heathen philosophy, might appeal to the heathen mind. But they had another aim, negative and indirect, yet of the foremost importance, — to expose the absurdities and immoralities of heathen mythology, reappearing in the revival of heathenism under the sanction of the popular nature-worships. In their resistance to these evil manifestations they make their appeal to spiritual religion, in behalf of a worship corresponding to the idea of God as a spirit. Distracted as the Apologists were by diverse tendencies, in the midst of which they sought to preserve the balance of truth, yet their predominant motive is spiritual, rational, and ethical under that influence proceeding from Plato whose object was to rescue man from his absorption in nature and restore him to his higher self. Tertullian forms perhaps the chief exception among them. With his passionate nature and susceptible spirit, hungering for the satisfaction of blind instincts that impelled him in contrary directions, he appears at one time as the violent opponent of the nature-religions, and again sanctioning as Christian teaching the principles of which these religions were the outgrowth. But no one protested more strongly than he against the gross immoral symbolism which was

justified by its adherents as having the sanction of the mysterious life of external nature.

The charge brought by the heathens against the Christian faith was its lack of the accessories necessary to constitute a religion: it had no temples, no altars or priesthood, no sacrifices or images. In the mode of defence adopted by the Apologists to vindicate the church against this misconception of true religion, may be discerned the prevailing attitude of the Christianity of the first three centuries. They urged a spiritual conception of God as an incorporeal being, without body parts or passions, who called only for a spiritual worship, which should consist in the homage of a grateful heart, and the offering of a righteous character. Temple and altar, sacrifice and image, from these they shrank as if they had been debased by their heathen associations or were injurious as well as unnecessary to the spiritual imagination. Had the Christians built churches and clothed their religion in the customary garb with which the heathens were familiar, they might not have been subjected to the same extent to heathen persecutions; for the worst misunderstanding with popular heathenism would have been avoided. When the Roman general Pompey penetrated the sacred shrine of Jewish religion, he was surprised to find it empty. But the Christians not only had no correspondent to the Holy of Holies in the Jewish temple; they eschewed even the Jewish sacrifice as not acceptable to God. Thus Justin Martyr, writing to the Jews, in his Dialogue with Trypho, remarks: "It was for the sins of your nation and for their idolatries, and not because there was any necessity for such sacrifices, that they were enjoined." A similar view was taken by Barnabas and by the author of the Epistle to Diognetus. But the Apologists, who defended the superiority of the Christian faith, even vindicated the absence of altar and sacrifice as though the essential characteristic of spiritual religion demanded their prohibition:

"Those who charge us with atheism," writes Athenagoras (c. 177), "have not even the faintest conception of what God is, they are foolish and utterly unacquainted with natural and divine things, and

measure piety by the rule of sacrifices. . . . As to our not sacrificing; the Framer and Father of this universe does not need blood, nor the odour of burnt offerings, nor the fragrance of flowers and incense, forasmuch as He is Himself perfect fragrance, needing nothing either within or without; but the noblest sacrifice to Him is for us to know who stretched out and vaulted the heavens, and fixed the earth in its place like a centre, who gathered the water into seas and divided the light from the darkness, who adorned the sky with stars and made the earth to bring forth seed of every kind, who made animals and fashioned man. . . . We lift up holy hands to Him; what need has He further of a hecatomb? . . . Yet it does behove us to offer a bloodless sacrifice and the service of our reason" (*Apol.* c. xiii.).

Minucius Felix, in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, also meets the accusation that the Christians have neither temples, altars, nor images with a similar reply:

"What image of God shall I make, since if you think rightly man himself is the image of God? What temple shall I build to Him, when this whole world fashioned by His work cannot receive Him? And when I, a man, dwell far and wide shall I shut up the might of so great majesty within one little building? Were it not better that He should be dedicated in our mind, consecrated in our inmost heart? Shall I offer victims and sacrifices to the Lord, such as He has produced for my use, that I should throw back to Him His own gift? It is ungrateful when the victim fit for sacrifice is a good disposition, and a pure mind, and a sincere judgment. Therefore he who cultivates innocence supplicates God; he who cultivates justice makes offerings to God; he who abstains from fraudulent practices propitiates God; he who snatches man from danger slaughters the most acceptable victim. These are our sacrifices, these are our rites of God's worship; thus among us, he who is most just is he who is most religious" (*Apol.* c. xxii.).

Even so late as the beginning of the fourth century, the apologist Arnobius can still urge the arguments of Athenagoras and Minucius Felix against the necessity of temples and altars, sacrifices, lights, and incense in order to the worship of God. It is true, he remarks, that the Christians repudiate these things because they think and believe that such honors are scorned by Deity (*Adv. Gentes*, cc. i., ii., iii. ff., and c. xxv.). And again, Lactantius, writing in the early part of the fourth century, maintains that only incorporeal sacrifices are becoming to offer to an incorporeal being:

"He needs not a temple, since the world is His dwelling; He needs not an image, since He is incomprehensible both to the eyes and to the mind; He needs not earthly lights, for He was able to kindle the light of the sun, with the other stars, for the use of man. What then does God require from man but worship of the mind, which is pure and holy? . . . It is justice only which God requires. In this is sacrifice; in this the worship of God" (*Instit.* cc. lviii., lxviii.).

But these utterances belong to the church of the first three centuries. Another motive was destined to become influential, which should so reverse the spirit and the action of the Christian church, that not only would language like this become unfamiliar and unwelcome, but it would even appear as hostile to the principles of Christian worship in a later age.

In this assault upon heathenism, no religion fared worse at the hands of Christian apologists or heathen satirists than the religion of ancient Egypt. It was in Egypt that the nature-worship had been most fully developed and had degenerated into the most puerile and senseless forms. Clement of Alexandria compared the women of his time, who lived only to adorn themselves, with the ornaments of Egyptian temples concealing repulsive objects in their innermost shrine:

"Their temples with porticos and vestibules are carefully constructed, and groves and sacred fields adjoining; the halls are surrounded with many pillars; and the walls gleam with foreign stones, and there is no want of artistic painting; and the temples gleam with gold and silver and amber, and glitter with parti-coloured gems from India and Ethiopia, and the shrines are veiled with gold-embroidered hangings.

"But if you enter the penetralia of the enclosure, and, in haste to behold something better, seek the image that is the inhabitant of the temple, and if any priest of those that offer sacrifice there, looking grave, and singing a pæan in the Egyptian tongue, remove a little of the veil to show the god, he will give you a hearty laugh at the object of worship. For the deity that is sought, to whom you have rushed, will not be found within, but a cat, or a crocodile, or a serpent of the country, or some such beast unworthy of the temple, but quite worthy of a den, a hole, or the dirt. The god of the Egyptians appears a beast rolling on a purple couch."[1]

[1] *Paedag.*, B. III., c. 2. Cf. Juvenal, *Sat.* xv. 1.

And yet out of Egypt, despised and forsaken, was to proceed a nature-philosophy whose aim was to justify the principles on which the worship of nature was based, resolving religion again into magic and theurgy. Egypt, indeed, was the home from whence the deepest inspiration for the heathen reaction proceeded. She had witnessed the decline of her worship and the contempt into which it had fallen, but she still nourished it with a sense of pride and superiority, justified by the contemplation of its history; and above all, as the outward symbols were neglected, she plunged into reverie over their secret inner significance. In the Hermetic books, there occurs a passage, at once a lament and a prophecy, — the last wail as it were over an expiring heathenism, accompanied with the imperishable conviction of its truth:

"Art thou ignorant, O Asclepius, that Egypt is the image of heaven, or rather that it is the projection here below of the whole order of heavenly things. And yet, as the sages have foreseen, there is one point which it is necessary you should know: a time will come when it will seem as if the Egyptians had in vain observed the worship of the gods with so great piety, and as if all their holy invocations had been sterile and unheard. The deity will leave the country and reascend to heaven, abandoning Egypt, its ancient sojourn, leaving it bereaved of religion and deprived of the presence of the gods. When the stranger occupies the land, not only will they neglect sacred things, but, what is still worse, they will forbid and punish by law religion and piety and the worship of the gods. Then this land, consecrated by so many chapels and temples, will be covered with death and tombs. O Egypt, Egypt! there will remain of thy religion only vague accounts which posterity will no longer believe — words graven upon stone, which will relate thy piety. . . .

"Thou weepest, O Asclepius! but there will be even sadder things than these. For Egypt herself will fall into apostacy, the worst of evils. She which was once the holy land, beloved of the gods for her devotion to their worship, will become the perversion of the saints, the school of impiety, the model of every kind of violence. Then man, filled with disgust for things, will no longer have for the world admiration or love; he will turn away from this perfect work, in the weariness of his soul; he will feel only contempt for this vast universe, this immutable work of God, this glorious and perfect constitution, this multiplex harmony of forms and representations, where the will of God, fertile in wonders, has brought everything together in one unique spectacle, in one harmonious synthesis worthy of perpetual

reverence and praise and love. But they will prefer darkness to light, they will find death better than life, and no one will retain regard for heaven" (*Ad Asclep.* ii. 8).

III

An important place must be assigned to Egypt in the history of man's religious development. It had attained the conviction of the immortality of the soul through the belief in a resurrection of the body; it insisted on an ethical standard as the test of human life in some final judgment. Beneath its gross irrational cultus there lay vague conceptions of the unity of God and His spiritual character, — that hidden wisdom cherished by its hierarchy wherein it was believed there lay the explanation and justification of the outwardly repulsive features of its mysterious worship. Situated at the junction of the continents of Africa and Asia, it had combined in its religion the tendencies of two races. From Africa came the worship of the animal creation, the most striking manifestation of the life of nature, in a land where the luxurious development of the forest or the vegetable world was unknown. From the remote East came the pantheism that merged God and humanity with outward nature. The transition, never completely accomplished, whereby Egypt endeavored to recognize in some degree the distinction between matter and spirit, was assisted by the peculiar character of its civilization, where man was called to the struggle with nature in order to his physical subsistence. Nature in Egypt presents no charm to the eye; it is a valley with a river and low hills in the horizon, a picture that makes no forcible appeal to the imagination. Hence humanity was not overawed or intimidated by the aspect of nature, but rather found its task in so ordering and improving the physical situation as to increase the facilities of human support. To utilize the sacred river, to take advantage of its moods and subordinate them to human welfare, was a task which cultivated a sense of the distinction between man and his environment, as also a sense of some divine harmony and fitness uniting them in a common sacred life.

At this point the religious development of Egypt halted. Greece seized from it the conception of the human as the culmination of the natural order, — a principle manifested in its literature, its religion, and, above all, in its art. Egypt was overloaded with the complexity of its problem. Its priests had glimpses of some higher truth not to be imparted to the multitude, or, if the attempt was made at expression, it was by means of symbols and hieroglyphs, concealing also the thought for which they stood. Egypt never produced a great literature. It had no Homer in song, no Plato in philosophy, no sacred books which could rival those of the Jews or of the Aryan races in India.[1] In place of these was the uninterpretable symbol which belonged to its monuments as an integral part, hinting at the divine life in nature, while also it buried its meaning in obscurity. The sphynx has been called the most distinctive symbol of Egyptian culture, whose eternal silence points to the recognition of a mystery in life, over which some veil is drawn that conceals while it reveals, where no formula of human speech is competent.

Neoplatonism was a movement which, in its latest phases, appropriated what was most characteristic of Egyptian religious culture. It combined Greek thought with Egyptian nature-philosophy, ending in results not clearly contemplated in its origin. In its relation to the age when it appeared, it has been summarized by Zeller: "Self-dependence and the self-sufficingness of thought made way for a resignation to higher powers, for a longing for some revelation, for an ecstatic departure from the domain of conscious mental activity. Man resigned the idea of truth within for truth to be found only in God. God was removed into another world, and stands over against man and the world of appearances in an abstract spiritual world. All the attempts of thought have but one aim, — to explain how it was that the finite proceeded from the infinite, and under what conditions its

[1] For the literature of Egypt, its sacred books and hymns, cf. Renouf, *Religion of Ancient Egypt* (The Hibbert Lectures, 1879), cc. 5, 6.

return to God is possible. But neither one nor the other of these problems could meet with a satisfactory solution." [1]

There is an affinity between Neoplatonism and the Gnostic schools in the Christian church, in that both held to a descending line of spiritual potencies proceeding forth from God, in their lowest range approximating the nature of what was evil and thus more closely related to man. But Neoplatonism differed from Gnosticism in not sharing with it the conviction that the world was evil, nor was it bent upon the exploiting of the evil or magnifying its sway. It sought to explain the origin of evil without the Gnostic anathema upon the creation. Although it held from Plato that matter was evil, yet it dwelt upon the power of the divine to associate matter with form, thus imparting to it a divine significance and potency, and redeeming it from its pristine negation and impotency. Matter thus redeemed enters into relationship with mind and thought. The tendency of Neoplatonism was toward the consecration of the world by the recognition of those features that carried suggestions of the divine creative thought and goodness. At this point it easily affiliated with the mystic lore of the Egyptian hierarchy. At this point, also, it discriminated itself from the teaching of Origen, who had gone too far in the excess of a spiritualizing tendency, to whom this world appeared as a penal institution, and the human body as a prison house for the immortal soul.

As Neoplatonism developed, it became more and more identified with tendencies against which Plato would have revolted. It was assuming that to be true which Plato had denied when he asserted the supremacy of reason, and led in the attack on the nature-mythologies. In its later phases it commingled matter and spirit, finding in matter the agency for accomplishing the highest spiritual results. Even Plotinus had admitted that the beatific vision was made possible by the physical trance, or by influences brought to bear upon the body. What had happened to Plotinus but rarely was reduced to a system by

[1] *Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics*, Reichel's Trans., p. 35.

his followers. A method was devised by magical and theurgic practices, giving the vision as often as it was desired. From being a system of philosophy, with a religious tendency, it passed over or degenerated into a religion whose object was to restore the nature-worships and revive the discredited mythologies. Its defence of the traditional religions was grounded in the conviction that they contained a vital element to which Christianity was a stranger, — the doctrine that the world was good and not evil, that God was immanent in the physical universe, revealing Himself and His goodness in the organic life of nature.

This change in Neoplatonism may have been mediated or hastened by its contact with the religion and religious philosophy of Syria and Egypt. It is to be noted also that this change coincides in time with the revival of the Greek Empire, when Greece had found a national centre at Constantinople, and was aspiring to rule the world in the place of Rome. Against this aspiration the provinces of Egypt and Syria revolted, with the result that national schisms had followed the theological controversies. The revival that came to the nature-worships affected the religion of Egypt, whose mysterious inner teaching, held in deposit by its priesthood, was now again imparted to Greek philosophers, as the supplement to the one-sided assertion of the spiritual, in God or man. The essence of Egyptian religion lay in its conviction of the revelation of God in the organic life of nature. In the Hermetic Books the material world is represented as if infused with spiritual potency, till the distinction between spirit and matter has almost disappeared. "Is the world good, O Trismegistus?" is the question Asclepius asks of his teacher; and the response is simple and emphatic, "Yes; the world is good." God is the source whence it has proceeded; it shares in the goodness which is the essence of God, each object in its degree, and according to its kind.

Neoplatonism did not become a religion, or fulfil its lofty aspiration of meeting the widest range of human needs,

and thus become a substitute for the Christian church. It answered, however, a purpose in its day by restoring a conviction of the divine order and goodness in the world of external nature. It threw a veil of sanctity over the life of man, and imparted a divine suggestiveness to human incidents and experience, binding together nature and spirit in some divine relationship whereby the natural ministers to the spiritual, and spirit interfuses or penetrates the natural. Some eternal law of correspondence was believed to bind the soul in harmonious ties with its material abode in the visible world. The declining polytheism seemed for a moment to have found its justification in the reason, against the assaults of a one-sided spiritualism. But these promises failed to be realized. There was not a sufficient basis in Neoplatonism for a religion. But whatever it held of truth, or adaptedness to its age, did not die, but passed over into the Christian cult, and more especially its conviction that in outward nature there was a veritable revelation of God to man.

IV

The failure of Neoplatonism to become a world religion was as conspicuous as it was complete. The Emperor Julian attempted to restore the worship of the gods, but the world of his time did not respond to his efforts or share in his enthusiasm. The gods of old religion had been discredited, by the long process of criticism; the mythologies were weak beyond the power of revival. Heathenism lacked the organization that the church had developed; it lacked also the principle of unity and simplicity, for which the world was hungering. To bring together all the heathen religions, with their vast number of deities, differing in name and character, and to unite them in one great pantheon, to reconsecrate their separate shrines, and all this by means of the great philosophical principle that they contained a revelation of God in the organic life of nature, was an imposing scheme, but it fell by its own weight. Christ had conquered because in Him, as the centre and

head of humanity, as well as the principle of life for the whole created universe, there lay the unity and the simplicity which the world demanded. But, on the other hand, the church was now beginning to assert, in emphatic ways of her own, the neglected truth that in the substance of the visible creation there was some kinship with Deity, as well as in the spirit and the reason of man. In this way Neoplatonism passed over into the Catholic church and became the inspiring principle of its ritual. Rome had bestowed upon the church her gift of organization and administration; Greece had lent her philosophy and intellectual culture; Egypt, with Syria, came last and furnished the motive of the cultus or worship, by whose agency the last vestiges of heathenism were overcome.

It was in the latter part of the fourth century that the transition was made. Egypt was the land where the doctrine known as Monophysitism had prevailed, — that the humanity of Christ was absorbed into His divinity, and the body of Christ was worthy of worship, together with His spirit, in one common adoration. The emphasis upon the body of Christ, as deified matter, was the essence of the heresy of Eutyches, which the Egyptian church championed as the logical sequence of its principle. In the expression now coming into vogue, that Mary was the Mother of God, is involved the new motive that the flesh of Christ, no less than His spirit, is taken up into His divine life as the Son of God, and becomes the bearer to the world of His redemptive power. When Nestorius protested against the application to Mary of the title Θεοτόκος, it became evident that the term had already won the suffrages of the faithful, and was too deeply rooted in their devotion to be overcome. In the anathemas which Cyril launched against Nestorius, it was the ever-recurring refrain to each proposition, "the Word was made flesh." Like Luther when he disputed with Zwingli, not condescending to explain but reiterating the phrase "*hoc est corpus meum*," so Cyril does not interpret but affirms the sacred but condensed formula, Ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο.

As the words had been interpreted in the earlier period, or as they have been understood in the church since the Reformation, they mean that humanity was united with divinity in the one person of Christ as the God-man. Thus Athanasius had written: "To say the Word became flesh is equivalent to saying that the Word became man."[1] The Athanasian Creed, as it is called, protests against the notion, as Athanasius also protested, that in becoming man the Word was transmuted into flesh: "He is one Christ, not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of the manhood into God." But Cyril did not guard himself against the growing popular conviction that the divine was transmuted into flesh — the preparation for the later belief in the doctrine of transubstantiation. Under the influence of Cyril's teaching, a physical Christology was taking the place of the earlier spiritual apprehension of the incarnation.[2] In the teaching of the first three centuries and in the writings of Athanasius the incarnation was conceived as a spiritual process and spiritual result. The divine nature and the human nature were united in the one personality of Christ as the God-man. But in the tendency that was invading the church from the time of Cyril, the conjunction of Deity with Mary was what struck the popular imagination. In the earlier thought, the miraculous birth of Christ had been viewed as a means to an end, — the attainment of a perfect humanity with which the divine nature should be united. But the conception that now began to prevail construed the means as the end, — the conjunction of the supernatural with the natural or physical in the womb of the Virgin became in itself the supreme act invoking the highest reverence.[3] In the earlier age, as also in the thought of

[1] *Epis. ad Epictetum*, lix., c. 8.

[2] Dorner, *Person of Christ*, Div. II., Vol. I., pp. 73 ff.; also Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, II., p. 336.

[3] There was from this time a growing tendency in the Catholic church, both in the East and in the West, to exalt the Virgin Mother to an equality with Deity. For its various manifestations, cf. Tyler, *Primitive Christian Worship*. Among the significant products of this mood was

Athanasius, the inspiring motive was the union of God with the human spirit, the divine reason with the human reason. In the new age beginning with Cyril, the motive had changed; what was sought for was the union of Deity with matter, or of God with the human body. According to the earlier apprehension of the mode by which the incarnation effected human redemption, it was the personality of Christ that entered into history as an abiding force, an influence of the divine spirit upon the human spirit, an ever-growing force in the whole sphere of human life, spreading by contact of man with man, till humanity should be lifted up out of sin and death into the life of righteousness and true holiness. But from the age of Cyril the new motive that began to operate, sought for some physical entrance of the incarnation into the human body, as though the earlier thought had been vague or unreal because invisible or intangible. It was the growing belief from the fourth century that the influence of the incarnation was mediated to humanity through the sacrament of the altar wherein the body of Christ, the body which had been born of the Virgin, was the indispensable means for the distribution in the world of His life-giving power.

A corresponding change was also taking place in the thought regarding God. The belief of the first three centuries that God was a spiritual incorporeal being[1] was yielding to the popular demand which could not grasp the idea of God unless He were conceived as possessing bodily form. It was in the latter part of the fourth century, when Christian thought was undergoing its great transition, that the attacks first began to be made upon the teaching and reputation of Origen. The assault pro-

the *Te Deum* of Mary, where her name was substituted for that of God, and the *Psalter* of Mary, where the same substitution gave her the highest divine honors.

[1] The apparent exception among the early Fathers was Tertullian, who asserted that God possessed a body. "Quis enim negabit, deum corpus esse, etsi deus spiritus est? spiritus enim corpus sui generis in sua effigie" (*Adv. Prax.* c. 7). Cf. Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, I., p. 487.

ceeded from Alexandria, which was then feeling the influence of the revived nature-philosophy, stimulated by Neoplatonist thought, and by the added force of Syrian mysticism. Because Origen had taught in spiritual language that the Son did not see the Father, as men see each other in the flesh, the Scetian monks raised the cry that Origen had taken away their Lord. What is known as Anthropomorphism, that God exists in human form, was now making its way in the church, in opposition to the uniform utterance of the early Fathers that God is a spirit. Because Chrysostom, the patriarch of Constantinople, protected the Nitrian monks who were not in sympathy with this materialistic conception of God, Theophilus, the patriarch of Alexandria, made war against him till he succeeded in procuring his banishment and his death in exile. The Origenistic Controversy, as it is called, has sometimes seemed so puerile and unworthy, that it has been passed over as a side issue not closely concerning the fortunes of the church. Gibbon did not deign to examine the religious motives at issue, but contented himself with exposing the villany of the bishops of Alexandria. It is, however, in these obscure passages in church history that the symptoms must be sought of deeper and inward transformations. The controversy over Origen, first raised by Egyptian monks, went on till Jerome was involved with the bishop of Jerusalem and with Rufinus in an angry contention concerning this and other features of Origen's theology.[1]

[1] Cf. Hieron. *Epis. ad Pammachium*, lxxxiv., and for the grounds of Theophilus' opposition to Origen, Hieron. *Epis.* xcii., xcvi. Cf. also Art. *Origenistic Controversies* in *Dict. Chris. Biog.* For the later opposition to Origen in the sixth century, see Mansi, IX., pp. 487 ff.; Hefele, *Concil. Gesch.*, Vol. VI.; also Walch, *Gesch. d. Ketzer*, Vol. VII. The character of Theophilus is not beyond reproach, but one may see that in his condemnation of Origen he was maintaining the rising sacramental theology which has its root in the belief in the sacredness of matter. Hence he objects to Origen's view that this world had its origin in a penal system, in order to expiate the sins of another stage of existence, and that the body of man is a punishment for prenatal sin. He emphatically condemns Origen's principle that the Holy Spirit cannot influence matter or animal life, because this would destroy the validity of baptism and the eucharist,

Rufinus, who had translated Origen in happier days, fell out with Jerome and their friendship was severed; but the life of Rufinus was henceforth a sad and anxious one. Ominous mutterings came from the bishop of Rome, indicative of a fierce temper toward Origen and those who would extend his influence, prophetic of the days when the inquisition should be the method of extirpating unwelcome opinions. Nor should Epiphanius be forgotten, whose mission was to stir up disaffection from which the church never recovered. In methods like these was the influence of Egypt felt. Political or national jealousies combined to give the Egyptian principle (Monophysitism) a stronger prominence and a deeper hold upon its adherents. But apart from all these considerations, stands out the significant

rites whose potency does not depend upon self-consciousness. In all this one may trace the Egyptian principle, as seen in the Hermetic Books, or in the later Neoplatonists. Theophilus also asserts that Origen's principle of contempt for matter brings marriage into disrepute. Jerome takes the same ground against Origen, complaining of his denial of the resurrection of the flesh or of using in place of it the word 'body,' by which some may be misled into thinking that he meant flesh. In his letter to Pammachius he makes the issue clear, that the opposition to Origen is based upon his exalted, one-sided spiritualism, which detaches the soul from the tabernacle of flesh in order to its redemption: "For my part, I will hold fast in my old age the faith wherein I was born again in my boyhood. They (the Origenists) speak of us as clay-towners, made out of dirt, brutish and carnal, because, they say, we refuse to receive the things of the spirit; but of course they themselves are citizens of Jerusalem and their mother is in heaven. I do not despise the flesh in which Christ was born and rose again, or scorn the mud which, baked into a clean vessel, reigns in heaven. And yet I wonder why they who detract from the flesh live after the flesh, and cherish and delicately nurture that which is their enemy. Perhaps, indeed, they wish to fulfil the words of Scripture, 'Love your enemies, and bless them that persecute you.' I love the flesh, but I love it only when it is chaste, when it is virginal, when it is mortified by fasting. I love not its works, but itself, that flesh which knows that it must be judged, and therefore dies as a martyr for Christ, which is scourged and torn asunder and burned with fire." For the anathemas against Origen, attributed to the Fifth General Council, cf. Mansi, IX. 395. See also Hefele, *in loc.*, for a discussion of the question whether they were actually put forth by this Council. Hefele thinks it doubtful, if not improbable. The spirit of the anathemas is denunciation of Origen for not attaching sufficient importance to the flesh or body, whether in the case of Christ or the future life of the saints. Cf. Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, II. 394, who holds that Origen was condemned at the Fifth General Council.

fact that the church had adopted the doctrine of the sacredness or sacramental quality of matter, as a ruling principle of its cultus, and was at war with what seemed the one-sided spiritualism of its earlier history.

In the doctrine of the sacredness of matter, whether actual or potential, the Catholic church completed her working scheme and was henceforth equipped for her task. She then entered upon the fulness of her career as a world power, with a more complete message for the age wherein it was her lot to be cast. The idolatry of heathen religions from this time rapidly disappeared in its external form or manifestation, swallowed up in the imposing cultus which overpowered the imagination till heathen rites became meagre and insignificant in the comparison. The religion that began with a simple faith in order to the victory over the world, was now clothed as an institution with more than the administrative power of Rome; as a system of thought, it had robbed Greece of its philosophical teaching and learned to use its dialectics for the illustration of its own dogmas; and at last it had caught the secret of the charm which heathen worship exercised over the imagination of its votaries. In heathen ritual the church had found its most obstinate opponent; for heathenism continued to survive in its sentiments of worship long after it had been deprived of its political prestige, or when it could no longer justify itself to the eye of reason. All the greater then seemed the final victory when the church produced a ritual eclipsing the splendor or significance of heathen mythology, presenting some higher form corresponding to that for which human instincts were seeking, when they sought to revive the heathen ritual and restore the physical worship of the ancient deities.

This movement within the church, which reversed its attitude, substituting a ritual for the earlier spiritual worship and relegating the early church to oblivion, as through the condemnation of Origen, has its analogue in Jewish history, where the same issue was involved from the time of the monarchy and the greater prophets; but where the opposite result was finally attained. The record of the

Kings of Judah reveals the purer worship of Jehovah as at a disadvantage compared with the attractions of Baal and Moloch or the immoral tendency of the groves and high places which led Israel to sin. Those who did what was right in the sight of the Lord were few in number compared with those who would have combined the worship of Jehovah with that of the false gods; but they persisted in their struggle against the fascinations of heathenism till at last they conquered, though at a fearful sacrifice. Their nationality was lost, their hopes and prospects for this world, at the moment when they had attained the higher end after the Babylonian captivity and had eliminated idolatry forever from their religion. The same attitude toward the worship of the creature had been preserved in the early Christian period, when the Jewish prohibitions against images and their worship, or creature-worship of any kind, were regarded by the church teachers as of perpetual obligation. When the Catholic church in the fifth century adopted the worship of images, making it a necessary and constituent part of its devotion; when the devotion to the creature, to Mary and the saints, rivalled if it did not surpass the honors given to Christ, — it was hopeless to expect any longer that Christianity as it was now understood could appeal to the Jewish mind. What stood for truth to the one had become error to the other. The conception of heresy had been reversed; the first principles of the Christian cultus were the heresies of orthodox Judaism. Not only did Judaism become irreconcilably opposed to the Catholic church, but in the deserts of Arabia preparation was made for a new religion, whose chief characteristic would be its hatred of idolatry, to whom the images of the Catholic church would be an abomination calling for the vengeance of God. But if the church could no longer appeal to Judaism, or if Mohammedanism was to rise up in protest against her idolatry, yet within the limits of the Roman Empire she worked with greater intensity and greater apparent success. Græco-Roman and Egyptian heathenism, their mysteries, their cult, were destroyed and disap-

peared forever, superseded by Christian ritual. The silent protest against this transformation of Christian worship became audible in later years, in the efforts of the emperors to put down Catholic idolatry, but it was then too late. Mohammedanism had already taken possession of the fairest territory of the Eastern church and was ultimately to get possession of its centre, the great Christian city of Constantinople. In all this there may be an allegory, some deeper teaching than is written in books, or is disclosed on the surface of events.

CHAPTER III

THE CHRISTIAN CULTUS[1]

I

THE cultus of the Catholic church, as distinguished from the simpler worship of the earlier Christian church, may be described as one vast effort to put a religious stamp upon both time and space, and thus to conquer for Christ the visible and invisible worlds. The appropriation of time by the church and its consecration to the ends which the church proposed is known as the Christian Year. It began with the recognition of the weekly cycle, when the first day of every week commemorated the resurrection of Christ, when Wednesday was kept as the day of His betrayal, and Friday of His crucifixion. It was a distinct loss that the Seventh Day, or the Jewish Sabbath, gradually fell into disuse; for it represented the commemoration of the creation of all things by God, when God rested from His work which He had created and made — a point of attachment to the natural order, in keeping with the Catholic purpose. But the antipathy to Judaism, the necessity also of distinguishing Christianity in some marked way from the earlier religion out of which it seemed to have emerged, prevented the retention of the Jewish Sabbath. In the substitution of Sunday, the *Dies Solis*, there is, however, the recognition of a kindred principle, so that the worship of the Sun, hitherto so

[1] Martene, *De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus*, Vol. III.; Bingham, *Antiq.* Bk. XX. Smith and Cheetham, *Dict. Chris. Antiq.*, Arts. *Christmas*, *Epiphany*, etc.; Usener, *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen;* Creuzer, *Symbolik und Mythologie der alten Völker;* Duchesne, *Origenes du Culte Chrétien.*

prominent in the nature-religions, is henceforth to be transformed and elevated by the superior power of the Sun of Righteousness. The Greek church for a long time continued to observe both days, with almost equal honor, while in the West the subordination of the Sabbath was so great that it seemed to the Greek church like a profanation. In the older church the custom prevailed of standing in prayer on the Sabbath and on Sunday, and of keeping the Sabbath during Lent as a festival day; but in the West it became a penitential day, when men knelt in prayer, unobservant of the joy and glory of the creation, with which the day was associated in the history of Judaism.[1]

From the weekly cycle the Catholic church passed to the annual cycle, forming the nucleus of the Christian year by the observance of Easter. The coincidence of Easter with the return of spring in the natural year is one of the points of attachment between the spiritual and physical order, and from the earliest time served to give the day a deeper hold on the Christian imagination. The sentiment that in the heathen world had rallied about the changes of the seasons, or had found in the Eleusinian or other Mysteries a religious expression, gained in the observance of Easter a point of contact, by which the transition could be made to the Christian ritual.[2] Easter would not have

[1] The Roman use of kneeling in prayer on the Sabbath was condemned by the Greeks at the *Concilium Quinisextum*, 692. Among modern Protestant churches there is one, the Seventh-day Baptists, which contends for the restoration of the Sabbath, as a day appointed by an irreversible divine decree. The contention has a certain theological significance as raising the issue of the mode of divine revelation. The higher honor given to Sunday is in harmony with the spirit of the New Testament and has the consensus of all the Christian ages.

[2] Cf. Hatch, *Hibbert Lectures*, 1888, pp. 283 ff., for the connection between the Greek Mysteries and Christian usages. In these scenic representations of the Eleusinian Mystery was symbolized "the earth passing through its yearly periods. It was the poetry of Nature. It was the drama which is acted every year of summer and winter and spring. Winter by winter the fruits and flowers die down into the darkness, and spring after spring they come forth again to new life. Winter after winter the sorrowing earth is seeking for her lost child; the hopes of men look forward to the new blossoming of spring. It was a drama also of human life. It was the poetry of the hope of a world to come. Death gave place to life. It was a *purgatio animae*, by which the soul might

been the day it has been to the Christian heart, if the faith in the resurrection of Christ from the dead had not been supplemented and confirmed by the natural joy and exhilaration attending the resurrection of the life of the visible world, till it is sometimes hard to say whether the anticipation of Easter is a spiritual or a natural emotion. The life of nature constitutes a tangible basis for Christian hope, while the spiritual resurrection glorifies and consecrates the external order, as though it were designed and adapted for the furtherance of man as a spiritual being.

The next great festival after Easter was the Epiphany, celebrated at the opening of the natural year (January 6). It stood for the manifestation of light to the world, when Christ after His baptism began to teach and to preach. From the Eastern church, where it originated, it was carried to the West in the early part of the fourth century. As first observed in the East, it had a twofold character: it commemorated in a subordinate way the birth of Christ, while it placed the chief stress upon that impressive moment of His baptism when Christ began His mission as the light of the world, by the proclamation of the truth; so that His birth and the preceding years of His life were but a preparation for the fulfilment of the incarnation, as also His manifestation was addressed to the reason and the conscience. But when the Feast of the Epiphany was carried into the West, its interpretation was so changed, that it almost lost its identity with the festival as it was kept in the East. In the Western interpretation, the manifestation of Christ is no longer presented as the matured consciousness of His mission, for which baptism was the inauguration; but the visit of the Magi to the infant Christ is substituted as the real epiphany or manifestation, when nature also appears as in sympathy with the new revelation, and a star in the heavens discloses a

be fit for the presence of God. Those who had been baptized and initiated were lifted into a new life. Death had no terrors for them. The blaze of light after darkness, the symbolic scenery of the life of the gods, was a foreshadowing of the life to come" (p. 288).

Saviour to the world. The idea of revelation as light, which was the favorite conception of the Eastern church, becomes to the West a physical light, and the manifestation of Christ is in and through the miracle. Epiphany has always been a greater festival to the Eastern church than to the Western, and even the observance of Christmas in the East has never quite superseded it in the popular devotion.[1] It had its affiliation also in the Eastern church with the natural order. In Gregory of Nyssa, we find the same recognition of the parallelism with nature in the Festival of Lights which crowned the Easter festival:

"When the length of the day begins to expand in winter time, as the sun mounts to the upper part of his course, we keep the feast of the appearing of the true Light divine, that through the veil of the flesh has cast its bright beams upon the life of men; but now when the luminary has traversed half the heaven in his course, so that night and day are of equal length, the upward return of human nature from death to life is the theme of this great and universal festival which all the life of those who have embraced the mystery of the Resurrection unites in celebrating.... There is some account to be given of both those seasons, how it is that it is winter time when He appears in the flesh, but it is when the days are as long as the nights, that He restores to life man, who because of his sins returned to the earth from whence he came.... Has your own sagacity, as of course it has, already divined the mystery hinted at by these coincidences: that the advance of night is stopped by the accessions to the light, and the period of darkness begins to be shortened as the length of the day is increased by the successive additions? For thus much perhaps would be plain enough, even to the uninitiated, that sin is near akin to darkness; and in fact evil is so termed in Scripture. Accordingly the season in which our mystery of godliness begins is a kind of exposition of the divine dispensation on behalf of our souls. For meet and right it was that, when vice was shed abroad without

[1] In Russia, "the services of Christmas Day are almost obscured by those which celebrate the retreat of the invaders on that same day, the 25th of December, 1812, from the Russian soil.... 'How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning!' This is the lesson appointed for the services of that day. 'There shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon and in the stars, and upon the earth distress of nations with perplexity. Look up and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh.' This is the Gospel for the day. 'Who through faith subdued kingdoms, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens.' This is the epistle" (Stanley, *Lectures on the Eastern Church*, p. 394).

bounds, the day which we receive from Him who placed that light in our hearts should increase more and more. . . . But the feast of the Resurrection occurring when the days are of equal length, of itself gives us this interpretation of the coincidence, — that we shall no longer fight with evil only upon equal terms, vice grappling with virtue in indecisive strife, but that the life of light will prevail, the gloom of idolatry melting as the day waxes stronger."[1]

In the development of the Christian year, it is a circumstance difficult to explain that Christmas Day should not have been introduced until after the middle of the fourth century. It had its origin at Rome, where it is first mentioned by the bishop Liberius in 360. From Rome it was carried to the East about 380, and in 386 is eulogized by Chrysostom as the chief of festivals. Its first mention in Alexandria is in the time of Cyril, or the earlier part of the fifth century. Although its observance spread rapidly after its first introduction and it rose into prominence in the popular devotion, yet there was opposition to it in the East on account of the change of the birthday from the 6th of January to the 25th of December, while among the Armenians it was never received, but the earlier usage was maintained. While Epiphany and Easter go back for their origin to the second century, and it is not till two hundred years later that the observance of Christmas is mentioned, yet from the moment of its first observance it grew rapidly in importance, especially in the West, till it rivalled the glories of the festival of Resurrection.

Any answer to the question why Christmas came so late takes us into the inmost thought of the ancient church and into the heart of the divergence between the Eastern and Western churches in their apprehension of the common faith. In the late introduction of Christmas Day and in the transformation of festivals by which Epiphany lost in the West its original character may be read more clearly than in the doctrinal controversies the thought of the church from the close of the fourth century. In the pre-

[1] *Epis. ad Euseb.* Cf. also his homily for the Festival of the Epiphany on *The Baptism of Christ.*

ceding period the attention of the church had been concentrated on the spiritual character of Christ as the divine Word revealing the mind and nature of God. The objective events in the life of Christ which had been foremost in the consciousness of the church were the transaction on Calvary when the sacrifice was offered for man's salvation, His resurrection from the dead, and His ascension to the Father. That the birth of Christ was not made equally prominent is evident from the fact that it is not mentioned in the creed set forth in the great Council of Nicæa. That the birth of Christ was subordinated in importance to His spiritual manifestation is evident also from the original idea of the Feast of Epiphany, where the matured consciousness of His mission is seen to coincide with the outward voice from heaven which proclaims Him to the world as the Son of God, in whom the Father is well pleased. At His baptism, when He first began to preach His message of human deliverance, the incarnation was complete for which the preparation had begun in His miraculous birth or conception. The festival of Epiphany attached the higher importance to this spiritual idea of the incarnation; and although the Festival came to include the commemoration of His birth, yet its strongest appeal to the spiritual imagination was the manifestation of Christ at His baptism as the Light of the world.[1]

[1] Cf. the *Expositor*, November, 1896, for *The Discourse of Ananias of Shirak upon Christmas* or *The Counter upon the Epiphany of our Lord and Saviour*. Ananias lived in the early part of the seventh century. He gives the argument for retaining the birthday of Christ on the 6th January, coinciding with His baptism. Ananias attributes the origin of Christmas as a festival independent of Epiphany to Cerinthus, the heretic. "If so, we can understand the hesitation of the orthodox church to adopt our modern festival of Christmas. Probably the real significance of the early union of the Nativity with the Baptism is that the Baptism was regarded as itself the true Birth of Christ. Docetic opinion may have been too strong in the earliest church to permit of His carnal or earthly birth being celebrated at all. Sometime in the fourth century the very early reading in Luke iii. 23, Thou art my beloved Son, *This day have I begotten Thee*, was erased from nearly all codices; no doubt because it was the stronghold of those who had declared the Baptism alone to be the true nativity of Jesus Christ" (F. C. Conybeare, in prefatory note to *Discourse of Ananias*, etc.).

In the Western church there was from the first a deeper importance attached to the birth of Christ, as is evident from its mention in the Apostles' Creed. It was Leo, the bishop of Rome (440–460), who first taught in a representative way the dogmatic significance of the Christmas festival, with whom also the Roman bishops began for the first time to exercise the functions of a preacher. In his homilies for Christmas Day, Leo does not present the incarnation as a progressive spiritual process, taking its initiation in the miraculous birth, and revealed in the growing favor of the youthful Christ with God and man, — a process first manifested in the baptism, and culminating in the agony of the garden; but rather the incarnation was in itself complete in the birth, or in the act of His conception. Upon this principle the Festival of Epiphany was readjusted in the Latin church; the incident of the baptism was dropped, the manifestation of Christ in His infancy was substituted for the manifestation at His baptism, when as a new-born child lying in the manger He exerted His kingly power, disclosing the divinity of His origin to the Wise Men from the East while still in His mother's arms. Leo does not draw the inference that worship is due to the Virgin Mother, but gives the principle on which the worship will be based in his glorification of Mary as the agent who shared with Deity in accomplishing the transcendent act of the incarnation.

The influence of the Latin church in the East, whose earlier traces may be seen in the third century, was at its height when Leo was allowed to dictate the decision at the Council of Chalcedon in regard to the relation of the Two Natures in Christ. While that decision was received as final by the Eastern church, yet it never reflected the inner mood or aspiration of the Oriental mind. At heart the Eastern church remained Monophysite. After various attempts had been made by imperial edicts to set aside the formula of Chalcedon, the result was finally accomplished, not by its abrogation, but by a reversal of its interpretation through a subtle dialectic; till it no longer constituted an obstacle to the development of the cultus in the East on

a Monophysite basis.[1] While in the West the Duophysite principle prevailed, as in the theology of Augustine, becoming the inward motive of Latin ecclesiastical institutions, in the dualism between church and state, or the religious and the secular; on the other hand, the Eastern church pursued its own peculiar career, unhampered by the Latin dualism. The distinction between the human and the divine was, in consequence, so obliterated that the state became of almost equal sanctity with the church; the distinction between the secular and the religious had no force in controlling the development of its institutions. In the West, the *nexus* between the divine and the human was conceived as accomplished by an act of the divine will, which brought together and held together conflicting attitudes. In the East, the bond of union was a certain inward fitness or organic affiliation by which the human passed over into the divine or was endowed in its own right with a god-like quality and power. It is this divergence which is manifested in the differing conceptions of the two festivals, Epiphany and Christmas Day.

The festival of Christmas may have been in its origin an adaptation of heathen festivals, reflecting the influence of the commemoration of the birthday of Mithras, or it may have been a counter festival set up in opposition to the heathen custom, with the design of supplanting it. It is hardly possible in view of its late origin that it was established independently and that the coincidence with the great day of the Sun, *Natalis Invicti Solis*, was purely accidental. On the one hand there is the protest of Leo in his *Homilies* that Christmas has nothing to do with the worship of the Sun, the warning that Christians should be on their guard against the foolish errors of heathendom,

[1] For the method and the influence of Leontius of Byzantium in reversing the interpretation of the formula of Chalcedon, cf. Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, II. 383 ff.; and Loofs, *Leontius von Byzanz und die gleichnamigen Schriftsteller der griechischen Kirche*, in *Texte u. Untersuch.*, Vol. III. A similar instance of the reversal of interpretation of a theological document is seen in Newman, *Tract XC.*, by which the Articles of Religion of the English Church were harmonized with the Tridentine teaching. Cf. *ante*, p. 351.

lest the joys of the Christian festival should lead them back to the darkness where men paid honor to the luminaries that minister only to the carnal sight. But there were those, on the other hand, who rejoiced in the coincidence by which at the darkest moment in the natural year the Sun began his return to the world again with the promise of light and life to the physical world, and that at this moment the Sun of Righteousness should be commemorated in the spiritual Christian year. Thus Prudentius in his hymn on *The Birthday of Christ:*

> "Quid est, quod arctum circulum
> Sol jam recurrens deserit?
> Christusne terris nascitur
> Qui lucis auget tramitem?"[1]

Or again, Paulinus of Nola:

> "Nam post solstitium, quo Christus corpore natus
> Sole novo gelidae mutavit tempora brumae,
> Atque salutiferum praestans mortalibus ortum,
> Procedente die, secum decrescere noctes
> Jussit."[2]

[1] *Cathemerinon*, XI.

[2] *Poema*, XIV. Cf. Sinker in Art. *Christmas* in *Dict. Chris. Antiq.*, for these and other citations. The following passage from a sermon, attributed wrongly to Ambrose, may stand for a widely prevalent sentiment: "Bene quodammodo sanctum hunc diem Natalis Domini *Solem navum* vulgus appellat, et tanta sui auctoritate id confirmat, ut Judaei etiam atque Gentiles in hanc vocem consentiant. Quod libenter amplectandum nobis est, quia oriente Salvatore, non solum humani generis salus, sed etiam solis ipsius claritas innovatur" (*Serm.* 6 in *Appendice*, ed. Bened, cited by Sinker). It has been suggested that the date 25th December may have been reached by an inference from the general belief that the creation took place in the spring, and that the new spiritual creation was also in the spring. The Annunciation of the Virgin, fixed on the 25th March, may have been the date from which Christmas was calculated in the West. There were those in the West who found no difficulty in keeping both the heathen and the Christian festival. Cf. Labbe, *Concil.* VI. 1170, where the practice is condemned. See also Schaff, *Ch. His.*, III. 394 ff., and Herzog, *R. E.*, Art. *Weihnachten.* That the twenty-fifth day of December was the day on which Christ was born is not known and cannot be inferred from any evidence in our possession. It is, of course, not impossible that tradition may have retained the day, but if so, there are no allusions to it before the fourth century, and the fact that the Eastern church should have kept the 6th January militates against this view. Modern scholars are divided in opinion as to whether

The consecration of time in the Christian year was a process not completed until every day of the year was devoted to the commemoration either of some feature in the life of Christ or of some saint in the long roll of apostles or prophets, martyrs or teachers. One-half of the year was occupied with the thought of Christ — from Advent till Ascension Day. The four weeks before Christmas were a preparation for the right reception of the coming of the Lord; the forty days before Easter were spent in fasting, after the analogy of Christ in the wilderness. A great drama was always enacting which lifted the imagination above the sordid events of ordinary life or the narrow interests of the individual, as if humanity were living in Christ, as if in His life all other lives were included. The great week before Easter set forth the events of His betrayal, His last supper with His disciples, His crucifixion, and His burial, constituting the crisis of the drama, when Christian feeling rose to its intensity and was prepared for the transcendent act of His resurrection. Heathen mythologies and mysteries lost their interest or found their fulfilment in a scheme like this, answering to every instinct of the natural man, but lifting him also into a higher range of sentiment and an all-embracing unity, in comparison with which the dreams of Neoplatonists seemed meagre and unreal. The greater festivals were intensified not only by the long anticipation that preceded them, but each great festival had its octave in which its day was prolonged, and to Easter were given forty days when the joys of Easter were the predominant mood. · In Ascension Day were dissipated the dark depressing moods of heathenism or of Judaism, which had peopled an under-world with empty shades. A higher world was revealed in the heaven above, where Christ had sat down in triumph at the right hand of the Father.

In this great creative process wherein the Catholic church was winning its final victory, the church also

Christ was born in December or in February. In behalf of the earlier date are the names of Jerome, Baronius, Ussher, Petavius, Bengel, Seyffarth; in behalf of the later are Scaliger, Hug, Wieseler, and Ellicott.

commemorated herself and her origin in the coming of the Spirit at Whitsuntide, coincident with the Jewish Pentecost. In the six months that follow, there are traces of the existence of a design, that, as one half of the year had been devoted to the commemoration of Christ, so the other half should reproduce the life of the church, — its foundation as by the Apostles, its militant stage as it undergoes trial and persecution, and its triumphant life as it continues unbroken in another world. It is in harmony with this design that the Sundays are counted from Pentecost; that the Festival of St. Peter and St. Paul should be celebrated on the 29th of June, representing the planting of the church; that the martyr Laurentius, about whose death there hung impressive memories, should be remembered on the 10th of August; and that in the fall of the year, a day should be given to the Archangel Michael and All Angels who stand for the life of the church in glory. As the season deepens, in the time of the completed harvest, was fixed the day of All Saints (November 1st), to be followed by the day of All Souls, the day of the great majority of human spirits who have passed away from the earth. But if there were such a design, it was obscured and defeated by the increasing number of saints for whom a place must be found, who invaded the half-year of Christ; and especially by the ever-growing devotion to Mary, who gradually appropriated a place for herself in every part of the year. This overloading of the Christian year tended to weaken at last its power and its hold upon the church, becoming too complicated a system for the mind to follow. But the grandeur of the scheme in itself bears witness like other Christian institutions to the power of the life of Christ perpetuating itself in the world.

II

The development of the Christian year, as the appropriation of time to the service of the church, was accompanied by another process, the consecration to the same end of

the elements of this material world. The doctrine that matter was evil, a doctrine so powerful and so prevalent in the early church, that it could not be overcome by an affirmation of the reason or by any argument, had entered the church as a first principle, in the teaching of Montanists as well as Gnostics; it had been assumed by asceticism and had contributed to the monastic movement; it lay at the root of the depreciation of marriage and the exaltation of celibacy to an equality with the angelic life. With one breath the church accepted it; with another she rejected it. There had arisen a reaction in the church against the teaching that matter was evil and the human body a tabernacle of vileness, a reaction which had gone so far as to condemn Origen and to banish Arianism; but it had not gone far enough to eradicate the principle itself. Whatever might be the working of the natural human instinct as revealed in worship, where the heart spoke in opposition to the head, there still remained an intellectual conviction that the world had fallen into the possession of the devil, and that the redemption wrought by Christ had been accomplished by paying some ransom to the devil in order to induce him to forego his grasp. The contamination of the material world by these adverse associations, or its exposure to the malign influence of countless demons, as the dethroned gods of heathenism came to be regarded, was met by a series of consecrations forming a list of growing exceptions to the prevalent evil order. The cultus of the church bears witness to such a method, in the process by which, in ever-increasing degree, it appropriated the forces or elements of nature for the advancement of the spiritual life, or by consecrations of material things gradually hallowed a space or sphere for the residence of the spiritual man.

This process began very early in the second century and may be said to be contemporaneous with the rise of the Catholic church; for one sees no traces of it in the accredited teaching of Christ or in the writings of St. Paul. It is to be found also, as is most natural, in those who are most deeply influenced by the doctrine that material nature

is evil; that the order of this present world has no relation to the well-being of the soul. When a man goes too far in one direction, he seeks to right himself by going in the opposite direction. Such an one was Tertullian, who, while holding the ascetic principle in its extremest form, was among the first to proclaim the spiritual agency of material things. In his treatise on Baptism, — a storehouse of suggestions for the process of ritual and sacramental development, he seems to be aware of the inconsistency of his attitude; but all the more bold is he and uncompromising in his assertion of what his spirit needed and demanded. He is aware that the Catholic church might be regarded as appropriating the features of the nature-religions, and no one was more familiar with them than he; but he turns the argument against them by the naïve statement that in the nature-religions the devil is at work imitating the rites of the Christian faith.[1]

The modern mind has become so accustomed to distinguish between the symbol and the truth which it signifies, that it is difficult to enter with any sympathetic appreciation into the feelings or thoughts of those in the ancient church who not only confused the sign with the reality, but boldly declared that the elements of the physical world were endowed by God with spiritual power. It is only when we realize that the Catholic church had undertaken the task of a mediator to the heathen world that we comprehend its motive in the development of a vast sacramental system, where physical nature and the human spirit are tied together as by a necessary inevitable bond, for the work of human salvation.

It formed no part of the belief of the earlier church that external matter as such might possess spiritual gifts. Or if there are allusions which may be interpreted in this way, they may also with equal propriety be interpreted in harmony with the principle which distinguishes between the symbol and that for which it stands. When Christ com-

[1] Cf. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* c. lxvi., where he speaks of "the wicked devils who have imitated in the mysteries of Mithras" the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

pares Himself to a vine and His disciples to the branches, or is said to be the rock from which flow living waters, there is no difficulty in interpreting the language as poetic or symbolical. The earlier church was rich in symbolic imagery, but its face was set in a different direction from that in which the Catholic church was travelling. It was looking away from this world to another, nor did it aim at the conquest of existing institutions or religions or philosophies. So far as it had a philosophy, it was compressed in the belief in the second coming of Christ, as an event near at hand, and about to bring the final satisfaction to all human needs and aspirations.

But one of the deeper issues of speculative thought in the Roman Empire was the adjustment of man to nature; a reaction, it may have been, from a Stoicism attaching no importance to the outer world, but concentrating its interest in the inner life of the soul; or from Platonism, with a kindred tendency, more bent upon adjusting the relation of man with God than with his physical environment. The world could not acquiesce without a shudder in the dark conviction of another school of philosophers, who pronounced the creation to be wholly bad. At the moment, then, when the revival of the nature-religions was bringing a certain relief to many through the feelings rather than through the reason, enabling them to regard nature as not alien to the spirit, we meet a similar tendency in the rising Catholic church, to connect hopes and aspirations which might otherwise seem vague and fleeting with the permanency of the life of nature, consecrating the body and the physical senses to the assistance of the spirit.

Tertullian declares plainly that the water of baptism possesses the power of sanctifying the soul, after it has been consecrated by the action of the Holy Spirit. He recognizes, indeed, that there are those to whom such a conviction will seem irrational. In the use of water he discerns a symbolic purpose. It seems as if he qualified his words so that actual spiritual efficacy should not be attributed to water, or were taking refuge in a non-com-

mittal phraseology, when he says: "After the waters have been in a manner endued with medicinal virtue, through the intervention of the angel, the spirit is corporeally washed in the waters, and the flesh is in the same spiritually cleansed."[1] But there was one text in the Old Testament which impressed the poetic mind of Tertullian as having more than a passing value, where, in the account of the creation, it is said that "the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." There was in his nature a certain materialistic tendency, at war with his ultra-spiritualistic mood. He did not refuse credence to a report he had heard, that some woman had seen the human soul. He was not averse to thinking that God possessed a body. He felt that sin and evil contaminated the human body, and that it must be cleansed in order to operate harmoniously with the purified spirit. Of the anointing oil, he speaks to the same effect: it runs down the body according to its carnal nature, but it profits the spirit, in that we are freed from sin.[2] In the laying on of hands also there may be "a sublime spiritual modulation."[3] In such ways do the "pleas of nature" combine with the "privileges of grace."

Tertullian is interesting and suggestive, more than many of the ancient Fathers, because in him is revealed the processes through which the age was passing. The contradictions of his nature find expression in the varying attitudes of his experience. He cannot be said to affirm, in a dogmatic way, the principles of the later sacramental theology, but he was testing them, as it were, in the crucible of his soul, finding them in vogue already in the Catholic church, wherein he had sought admittance as

[1] *De Bap.*, c. iv.: "All waters, therefore, in virtue of the pristine privilege of their origin, do, after invocation of God, attain the sacramental power of sanctification; for the Spirit immediately supervenes from the heavens, and rests over the waters, sanctifying them from Himself; and being thus sanctified, they imbibe at the same time the power of sanctifying." But again: "Not that in the waters we obtain the Holy Spirit, but in the water under the influence of an angel and prepared for the Holy Spirit." Cf. also *De Bap.*, c. vi.

[2] *De Bap.*, c. vii.

[3] *De Bap.*, c. viii.

a venture of faith. One cannot dismiss his treatise on Baptism without recalling the pathetic eloquence of its closing prayer: "Therefore, blessed (friends), whom the grace of God awaits, when you ascend from that most sacred font of your new birth, and spread your hands for the first time in the house of your mother, together with your brethren, ask from the Father, ask from the Lord, that His own specialties (and) distributions of gifts may be supplied you. 'Ask, saith He, and ye shall receive.' Well, you *have* asked, and have received; you *have* knocked, and it has been opened to you. Only, I pray, that when you are asking, you be mindful, likewise, of Tertullian the sinner."

The disposition to identify the symbol with the thing signified, or to make material elements the agencies for inducing spiritual effects, however widespread it may have been, must also have encountered scepticism and opposition, or Tertullian would not have labored so hard to demonstrate, whether to himself or to others, its rationality. While the symbolism of material things might be suggestive and impressive, yet it seems like a long step to reach the conclusion that the external application of water or of oil could have any part in the inward purification of the spirit. But for this step the Catholic church was making preparation from an early moment in its history. Nearly two hundred years had elapsed after Tertullian wrote, when we find the church Fathers still laboring with the same scepticism or opposition, but also more strongly convinced of the possibility that matter might receive a spiritual endowment for the regeneration of the inward nature. In his *Lectures on the Mysteries*, the bishop Cyril of Jerusalem fell back upon faith, which he urges on his catechumens as the means of attaining the conviction that the physical sign carried an inward potency. The oil, he says, used in the exorcism at baptism possesses a charm for driving away of hostile influences. Or again, the chrism, the oil used in the service of Confirmation, he declares, is not plain ointment, but it is a gift of grace from Christ, and by the coming of the Holy Spirit "is

made fit to impart His divine nature." And yet Cyril in such sentences as these may be using only the exaggerated language of the heart, whose love is capable of transfiguring the commonest object; for he also adds the intelligible sentence, that while the ointment is symbolically applied to the forehead, the soul is sanctified by the Holy and life-giving Spirit.

But when he speaks of the elements of bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, his language does not waver. He calls on his hearers to regard them not as bare elements, but as the body and the blood of Christ. The senses may suggest their material nature, "yet let faith establish thee. Judge not the matter from the taste, but from faith be fully assured without misgiving that the body and blood of Christ hath been vouchsafed thee."[1] Or again, "trust not the judgment of thy bodily palate, but trust to faith unfaltering, for they who taste are bidden to taste, not bread and wine, but the antitypical body and blood of Christ."[2]

Another writer contemporaneous with Cyril of Jerusalem was Gregory of Nyssa (350–394 c.). A special interest attaches to the views of both these men regarding the symbol, because they lived in the age when the liturgy was in the process of development. In a sermon on the Baptism of Christ, preached on the Day of Lights (Epiphany), Gregory takes occasion to speak of the Mysteries, which cleanse both body and soul. In his audience there were the uninitiated as well as believers, which gives him the opportunity to explain or recommend what is not intelligible or attractive to the unbelieving mind, — the relation of the physical to the spiritual in the work of regeneration. "This gift of regeneration," he says, "is not bestowed by water, for in that case the water were a thing more exalted than all creation; but by the command of God and the visitation of the Spirit, that comes sacramentally to set us free. But water serves to express the cleansing.' But after having thus plainly set forth the use of water as a symbol of spiritual purification, accord-

[1] *Mystag.*, III. 3. [2] *Mystag.*, IV. 6.

ing to the analogy of cleansing the body in the bath, he turns to the deeper consideration of the subject, and then we lose his meaning in what is sometimes called the sacramental phraseology, where it is impossible to say whether he means to be understood literally or not, — whether there is an objective reality and efficacy in the sacred symbols or whether they represent some subjective process in the regenerated mind:

"Man, as we know full well, is compound, not simple: and therefore the cognate and similar medicines are assigned for healing him who is twofold and conglomerate; for his visible body, water, the sensible element; for his soul, which we cannot see, the Spirit invisible, invoked by faith, present unspeakably. For 'the Spirit breathes where He wills and thou hearest His voice, but canst not tell whence He cometh or whither He goeth.' He blesses the body that is baptized and the water that baptizeth. Despise not, therefore, the divine laver, nor think lightly of it, as a common thing on account of the use of water. For the power that operates is mighty, and wonderful are the things that are wrought thereby. For this holy altar, too, by which I stand is stone, ordinary in its nature, nowise different from the other slabs of stone that build our houses and adorn our pavements; but seeing that it was consecrated to the service of God and received the benediction, it is a holy table, an altar undefiled, no longer touched by the hands of all, but of the priests alone and that with reverence. The bread, again, is at first common bread, but when the sacramental action consecrates it, it is called and becomes the body of Christ. So with the sacramental oil; so with the wine; though before the benediction they are of little value, each of them, after the sanctification bestowed by the Spirit, has its several operation. The same power of the word, again, also makes the priest venerable and honorable, separated, by the new blessing bestowed upon him, from his community with the mass of men. While but yesterday he was one of the mass, one of the people, he is suddenly rendered a guide, a president, a teacher of righteousness, an instructor in hidden mysteries; and this he does without being at all changed in body or in form; but while continuing to be in all appearance the man he was before, being by some unseen power and grace transformed in respect of his unseen soul to the higher condition. . . . Learn, then, that hallowed water cleanses and illuminates the man."[1]

[1] In the language of Cyril of Alexandria († 444) we find a still more emphatic assertion of this principle: "By the agency of the Holy Ghost the water perceived by the senses is metamorphosed into a certain divine and ineffable power:" *Διὰ τῆς τοῦ πνεύματος ἐνεργείας τὸ αἰσθητὸν ὕδωρ πρὸς θείαν τινὰ καὶ ἀπόρρητον ἀναστοιχειοῦται δύναμιν* (*In Joan.* 3, 5).

Gregory recognizes that his explanation still leaves something unexplained, for he takes refuge in the mystery of the origin of physical life, as analogous to the birth of the life in the Spirit; so that if any one still feels that he does not comprehend, he may be reminded that he also does not understand the generation of life in the natural order. And there the matter must be left.

The passage which has just been quoted is a remarkable one as affording a clew to the interpretation of the liturgies, especially those of Oriental origin. Whatever difficulties are felt in the latter are found here; whatever merits or attractions the liturgies contain the language of Gregory also possesses. He is describing the mood, the attitude toward outward nature, which dominated the Catholic church in its devotions, where the intellectual entanglements of the age were forgotten, as the heart went forth in the worship of God. But beneath the language of both, there runs an intellectual principle, even though it is not seen or should be disowned; there is a philosophical assumption, concealed but no less operative, which it is important to discern. The defect in Gregory which vitiates his reasoning, confusing both himself and his readers, is a failure to distinguish between the action of the human imagination and the power of God. The human mind possesses the capacity to transfigure common objects under the influence of some great passion. What the heart feels under the spell of deep and quickened emotion, sometimes finding expression in poetry, but here in worship, is projected forth as if an external reality, existing apart from the imagination, and as owing its origin to the exclusive action of the spirit of God. In theological language, this is known as Monophysitism — the doctrine of the one nature, in which the human and the divine are fused together and the human is submerged in the divine. What was detected and condemned by the reason as an error in theology, was not recognized when transplanted to the sphere of worship, where the heart reigns supreme. The liturgy had already taken shape before the tendency which inspired it had been clearly revealed to the reason;

the spirit of the hour was too strong to be suppressed, as in its creative activity it was moulding the forms of the cultus under whose influence the Catholic church was henceforth to move and live and have its being.

III

The worship of saints, and of the images and relics of saints, becomes from the fourth century an important feature of the Catholic cultus. Its origin is easily connected with those universal human instincts which find expression in every age. The recognition of great men as benefactors of humanity in whom there seems to dwell a certain godlike quality; the need as it were of human leaders and heroes whom men in honoring honor also themselves; the desire to possess and to see their likeness, as if the soul in them shone forth through the body; the feeling that one comes nearer to them by something which they have touched and handled; the reverence which is felt for their ashes, — all these are alike characteristic of men always and everywhere. Even in our own age, the positivist who worships humanity bears witness to the instinct out of which has grown much of the ancient polytheism and mythology.

But in the Catholic church of the fourth century, this tendency toward the worship of saints and images and relics was part of a larger movement having its roots in the past, in the conflicts of thought and feeling begotten by the schools of Greek philosophy. The worship of saints and relics was only the consequence of that reaction against the Gnostic doctrine that the natural order is evil. Platonists, Stoics, and others who had distinguished between spirit and nature, body and soul, God and the creation, as divided by some impassable gulf, were included in the same reaction. A new Platonism had reasserted that the world was good, and had endeavored to restore the unity of things, avoiding the dualism and disharmony which had resulted from the acceptance of the tenet that matter was evil or was unworthy of association

with the spirit. The Christian Fathers followed the movement, as though seeking to restore again that earlier unconscious mood wherein ancient Greece had revelled, and had developed the glories of its art, when man was but part of his environment, and the advice of Socrates that men should seek to know themselves had not as yet brought the sense of inward contradiction.

Hardly had the doctrine of the incarnation been so stated and secured by Athanasius as to become the possession of the church, when it was drawn into the strong current of this powerful reaction and subordinated to a purpose Athanasius had never contemplated. The belief in the incarnation produced indeed an inward mood of exultation, for it involved the redemption of nature and of humanity from the stigma of evil. The victory over Arius was equivalent to the assertion that the world was good; for Arius had taught that an incarnation of God was impossible on account of the unworthiness of the material creation to be so closely associated with the divine. But Athanasius had not foreseen how his teaching would be warped from its true intent by this intenser mood which now seized upon his doctrine and, changing its spirit, made it the instrument of a revolution in cultus and in theology. He himself had protested against the worship of the flesh, or of images, as a heathen degradation.[1] He had dwelt upon the spiritual aspect of the incarnation, as the revelation of the inmost mind and character of God; and upon its evidence as addressed to the spiritual faculty, not to sensuous perception. When he cited the expression "the Word was made flesh," he had also carefully defined its meaning; not as indicating that the Word was transmuted into flesh, but rather as an equivalent expression for "the Word was made man."[2]

But it was just that expression, *the Word was made flesh*, upon which the imagination seized, as language needing no paraphrase; in its literalness, it hinted at the idea of

[1] Cf. *De Incar.*, cc. 11–18; also *Epis. ad Epictetum*, *Or.* III. *c. Ar.*, 25, II. 16.

[2] *Epis. ad Epictet.*

some infusion of spirit into flesh by which the flesh was also deified and became the instrument of man's salvation. The doctrine that the body of Christ was deified henceforth became the foundation stone of the Catholic cultus, involving the principle that a life-giving influence proceeded from His body which is imparted to men as the food of the soul in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; involving also the apotheosis of the Virgin Mother, as the source whence He had drawn His life-giving body; and involving also the worship of the bodies of the saints in whom His life had been manifested.

So early as the time of Tertullian († c. 220 A.D.), this tendency toward the deification of matter had found expression in the Catholic church. In his treatises on The Flesh of Christ and on The Resurrection of the Flesh, Tertullian was fighting both heathens and heretics, who vilified matter and despised the body, or who refused to admit that Christ had possessed an actual body (Docetism). In his opposition to this attitude he almost fell into a materialism which could speak of spirit in the terms of matter. This tendency was nourished also by the Christian custom of burying the dead, in place of the heathen usage of cremation, — a custom out of which grew much that was most beautiful and attractive in Christian piety, while also it became the germ of great abuses, the rallying-point of much of the later development of the Catholic cultus. It deepened the faith in the immortality of the soul, by the importance it attached to the human body, which the usage of cremation sacrificed; and it ministered to the doctrine of the communion of saints. The resurrection of the flesh, of the same body which had lain in the grave and seen corruption, was, however, to Tertullian one of the things which he believed, without reason, or, as he says, even against reason, just because it was impossible and absurd.

In the church Fathers of the latter part of the fourth century, and more particularly Cyril of Jerusalem and Gregory of Nyssa, there is an effort to ground these convictions of Tertullian in a materialistic philosophy.

A greater significance is attached to the body and to the senses, as the agencies on which the mind is dependent. Gregory of Nyssa inclines to reverse the attitude of Athanasius, who had held that the senses are the instrument played upon by the mind,[1] and maintains that the mind works by means of the senses.[2] The Holy Spirit is conceived as the bond which unites the two spheres, the physical and the rational, in some organic fashion. Since it is the function of the Spirit to sanctify the man wholly, He must needs act upon body as well as soul, penetrating by His power the water, the oil, the bread, and the wine, and bending them to a spiritual efficacy for the body, as well as acting more immediately for the purification of the inner life. On this basis it is not difficult to understand how Cyril of Jerusalem could affirm, that "even though the soul is not present, a virtue resides in the body of the saints, because of the righteous soul which has for so many years dwelt in it, and used it as its minister."[3] Such was the formula for the worship of the bodies of the saints, and of their relics, which became more interesting, more real because more tangible, than the worship of God in spirit and in truth.

This tendency to confuse the material and the spiritual till they become practically identified, culminates in the teaching of Gregory of Nyssa in regard to the eucharist. His ruling principle is that when Christ assumed a body, He deified the flesh and everything kindred and related to it. But since the human body subsists by meat and drink, therefore when one looks on bread he is, in a way, looking upon the human body. And when this principle was applied to Christ, the body into which God entered, since it partook of the nourishment of bread, was, in a certain meas-

[1] *Contra Gentes*, § 31. [2] *De Hom. Op.*, cc. viii., x.

[3] *Cat.*, XVII. 16. Cf. also Greg. Naz. to the same effect in *Adv. Julian, Or. III.* The church Fathers of the latter part of the fourth century were almost unanimous in accepting this principle; cf. Schaff, *Ch. His.*, III., p. 457. Even Origen, while admitting that this growing tendency to the worship of relics, including the body of departed saints, was an error, yet thought that a right instinct lay beneath it. Cf. *Con. Celsum*, IV. 59.

ure; the same with bread, inasmuch as bread changes into flesh. Hence it follows, that since the body of Christ maintained by bread was transmuted by the indwelling of God the Word into the dignity of Godhead, so the bread which is consecrated by the Word of God is changed into the body of God the Word. What is true of the bread is true also of wine, since the body requires liquids for its nourishment as well as solid food:

"Since, then, seeing that Godhead containing flesh partook for its substance and support of this particular nourishment also, and since the God who was manifested infused Himself into perishing humanity for this purpose, viz. that by this communion with Deity mankind might at the same time be deified, for this end it is that, by dispensation of His grace, He disseminates Himself in every believer through that flesh, whose substance comes from bread and wine, blending Himself with the bodies of believers, to secure that, by this union with the immortal, man too may be a sharer in incorruption. He gives these gifts by virtue of the benediction by which He trans-elements (μεταστοιχειώσας) the natural quality of these visible things to that immortal thing." [1]

In the further development of the cultus the church reflected the influence of the same tendencies which produced the Christian year. The church was placing its stamp upon matter and space as well as time, upon the external world of visible nature as well as upon the inner life of the spirit. It peopled space with an army of saints, who were believed to share in the divine omnipotence and omniscience, with Mary the Queen of Heaven as their head and summit. The spaces left empty by the dethronement of heathen deities and heroes were refilled with Christian martyrs and confessors, ascetics and theologians, with all who had reflected lustre on the Catholic church. In sacred acts of worship, at its most solemn moments, Mary and the saints were associated with God, as those to whom alike a common confession of sin should be made, and from whom alike pardon was invoked. The new Christian mythology was a purer and higher thing than that which it supplanted; it gave richer food for the

[1] *Cat. Mag.*, XXVII.

imagination, but, like the old mythologies, it had a tendency to obscure the Deity, to relegate to the background the great first cause, till it became difficult for the popular mind any longer to conceive His presence or activity. In moments of emergency the first appeal was to Mary or the saints. But whatever the defects of this substitute for the pagan mythologies, it was successful at last in removing the traces of the nature-religions, even though it were accomplished by the assimilation of the principle out of which they had grown.

The Catholic church was also putting its stamp, by means of the cultus, upon the external world. In so doing, it practically sacrificed or abandoned the truth for which Plato and Greek philosophy had been struggling,—that the spirit was superior to matter, belonging to some higher order in the grades of existence. The spirit henceforth became dependent upon the agency of matter for its salvation; matter was no longer vilified nor contempt thrown upon it as in the earlier age. The doctrine known as the *opus operatum*, according to which the outward act is effective for salvation, so that the sacrament may work its result for the spirit apart from its participation in Christ by faith, was the issue of the deification of matter; just as contact with a relic, the bone or the clothing of a saint, acted directly upon the soul without its special consciousness or effort to appropriate the good. The only point to be determined was the question of validity, whether of sacrament or relic, and that determination rested in turn upon some virtue communicated to matter, through a tangible relationship, not, according to the theory, begotten by the self-conscious spirit. Just as in the ancient nature-worships, where inanimate things were reverenced as divine, and animals occupied the most sacred shrines of temples, so in this Christian materialism, in which the spirit was submerged in a physical process, the Catholic church seemed to revel without reference to the claims of the reason or in defiance of them. Churches were built over the graves of saints, in order to their highest conseeration. At last it became a law that a church

should not be consecrated without the possession of some relic, whose hallowed power, derived from the body of a saint, lent sanctity to the structure, and the ground on which it rested. If one penetrated to the inmost source of this physical sanctity, the result might seem as incongruous as when in Egyptian temples a cat or a crocodile, reposing in its sacred penetralia, was disclosed to the inquiring eye. In the Catholic church it might be a fragment of clothing, or a piece of bone, or a bit of wood. Such was the power of the relic, that when the Persians stole the Holy Cross, the Roman Emperor Heraclius went to war for its recovery.[1] The essence of the miracle in the Oriental church consisted in the sympathy of nature with man, as lending her agencies to his spiritual betterment; in contrast with the earlier conception of miracle, in the Latin world, in which man is resisting nature and overcoming the laws which bind him in chains to the low and hopeless uniformity of its career. All the evils which beset and threaten the body from without, and through the body endanger the life of the spirit, may be banished by a simple physical act in the sign of the cross. "Make this sign," says Cyril, "at eating and drinking, at sitting, at lying down, at rising up, at speaking, at walking, in a word, at every act. . . . When thou art going to dispute with unbelievers, concerning the Cross of Christ, first make with thy hand the sign of Christ's cross and the gainsayer will be silenced."[2]

[1] For the discovery of the Holy Cross, cf. Socrates, *H. E.*, I. 17, and Sozomen, *H. E.*, II. 1. Both writers belong to the fifth century. Eusebius does not mention it, which is significant. Its first mention is apparently by Cyril of Jerusalem (cf. *Cat.*, IV. 10 [c. 350]), who says that since its discovery the whole world has been filled with pieces of it.

[2] *Cat.*, IV. 14, XIII. 22. Cf. also Tertullian, *De Res. Car.* c. viii., where he says: "The flesh is the very condition on which salvation hinges. Since the soul is, in consequence of its salvation, chosen to the service of God, it is the flesh which actually renders it capable of such service. The flesh, indeed, is washed, in order that the soul may be cleansed; the flesh is anointed, that the soul may be consecrated; the flesh is signed (with the cross), that the soul too may be fortified; the flesh is shadowed with the imposition of hands, that the soul may be illuminated by the Spirit," etc. The anticipation by Tertullian of so many of the features of the later Catholic cultus seems to point to the conclu-

The sign of the cross was but one of a series of physical acts by which spiritual results were secured. Benedictions and consecrations innumerable, whether bestowed on man or on objects and places in the visible external world, had the effect of divinizing the environment of life, as though heaven itself were being reproduced in this lower world. Churches and all things related to them, vestments and altar books and bells, the holy water, the private houses also and the cemeteries, were redeemed from the curse of a world which had once lain in bondage to Satan, and were secured or exempted from all assaults of evil agencies. There were sacred places wherever a saint had lived or died, and especially Jerusalem, where the footprints of the Saviour still remained miraculously preserved, with the crowning sanctity of the Holy Sepulchre. To worship in these places was to be in closest contact with the spiritual world. The sacred water and oil, the bread and the wine, the contact of consecrated hands in the sacraments of confirmation, ordination or marriage, the holy unction in sickness and in death, — all these conveyed a sanctifying influence at every stage or turn of life. They were the means by which the Holy Spirit was imparted, that Spirit which fused together in one common life God and the natural world.

The development of the nature-philosophy which regards the elements and forces of the material world as

sion that in his reaction from the one-sided spiritualism of Greek philosophy, or as represented in the West by the ethical teaching of Marcus Aurelius, Seneca, Epictetus, and others, which despised the body, he turned to the church for relief, bringing with him a tendency toward a materialistic interpretation of the church's attitude, which must have helped to create in the church what did not before exist. That instinct which Tertullian sought to gratify in the Catholic church carried others into the nature-religions of the East, which were then becoming popular in the West. Tertullian betrays a consciousness of the similarity between his own position and that of the adherents of the nature-religions, but his defence is never quite satisfactory. That he found his position untenable is shown by his desertion of the Catholic cultus, which he had done so much to create, for the ultra-spiritual sect of the Montanists, — a typical career, which reveals the deepest symptoms of the age.

ministering to human salvation was the peculiar work of the Oriental mind in the Eastern church. The distinctive principle in this philosophy is the action of the Holy Spirit, whose function is primarily conceived as that of a mediator between external nature and the human soul. Such was the view of Cyril of Jerusalem and Cyril of Alexandria, Gregory of Nyssa and Ephraim of Edessa,—writers whose influence upon the cultus was most profound. It is the Holy Ghost who mingles with the waters of baptism and is blended with the bread of the Holy Eucharist. In proportion as the worship of the church found its chief expression in the sacrament of the altar, did this doctrine of the Spirit prevail. Its influence in the Eastern church tended to destroy the belief that Satan had this world in his grasp. This dark conviction was not met, as in the Western church, by a process of thought, elaborating the doctrine of atonement, but it seems to vanish without argument, as under the spell of some mighty enchantment. Hence we note in the Greek Fathers of this period the sense of the beauty of nature. The Cappadocians more particularly gave expression to their love of nature in a way almost modern in its tone, but which forms an exception in patristic literature. Even the Emperor Julian under the kindred influence of Neoplatonism has shown in his letters a deep and sincere appreciation of the beauty of scenery, describing it with the eye of an artist. Again this doctrine of the Spirit modified the conception of the miracle in the Eastern church. It is the Holy Spirit working in, with, and under the forces of nature, who accomplishes the miraculous birth of Christ and His resurrection from the dead. So also in the sacred rites of the church in baptism, in the chrism, and in the eucharist, the same action of the Holy Spirit is continued and perpetuated. There is no violation of the laws of nature, no transcending of nature by the human spirit or by the divine will, which in the Western conception of the miracle was the predominant thought. The application of the atonement, the realization of the redemption through Christ, consists in the interpenetration of physical nature by the

Holy Ghost. Thus the incarnation of Christ is mediated to the individual man by participation in His deified body given in the eucharist, rather than by the power of his divine personality entering into human lives and remoulding the human consciousness.

The church in the West received a certain influence from the cultus of the Eastern church, but it did not receive this doctrine of the Holy Spirit; it apprehended the divine action in the world as exceptional or accomplished by specific acts of the divine will, or by the impartation of the divine power to the human will. . The tendency in the West was to regard the Holy Spirit as an inward agent for the purification of the soul.[1] Hence there came also in the West a theological activity and an intellectual life to which the East was a stranger after the cult had established its ascendency over the imagination. The Spirit which searcheth all things, even the deep things of God, was a sword of division in the Western church penetrating the inmost nature of man, but destined to bring forth a higher result, when its work should be manifest in the fulness of time. But the Western church appropriated in its own way many of the results of the nature-philosophy which had been developed in the Oriental world. The worship of Mary, of saints and images, relics and sacred places, consecrations of material things, all these found a sphere in the devotion of the Latin church; but the principle of the nature-philosophy was never entirely domesticated in Western Christendom.[2]

[1] Cf. Augustine, *De Fide et Symbolo*, c. 19; also Swete, H. B., Art. on *Holy Ghost* in *Dict. Chris. Biog.*

[2] The following passage from a Latin writer in the thirteenth century indicates at once the agreement and yet the divergence between the Eastern and the Western cults: "Observe that when a person in confirmation is blessed on the forehead, and when salt, and water, and palls, and vestments, and the like be consecrated, the hands are held over them, because there is a certain virtue in consecrated hands, which is, as it were, stirred up when benediction is poured out over anything with the hands suspended in this way. Whence the Apostle admonishing his disciple Timothy, saith: 'I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the laying on of my hands.' So that devotion may be stirred up in the body by the suspension of hands, just as in the heart by the effect. For virtue existeth not only in ani-

IV

The foundations had already been laid for Catholic ritual, its corner-stone had been sunk deep in material nature, in order to what seemed a more real and tangible spiritual structure, when an unknown writer emerged in the East who completed the preparation and clothed the growing cultus with an unearthly and almost ineffable splendor; justifying its inner principle by a philosophical appeal, which went to the heart of his age and has ever since exerted a wide and profound influence in the Catholic church. His time may have been the latter part of the fifth century; he was first heard of in the year 532 at a conference in Constantinople when reference was made to his writings; he is known in history as Dionysius the Areopagite.[1] In accordance with a literary custom whose honesty was not then questioned, he wrote in the name of that Dionysius whom Paul converted at Athens, addressing his books or letters to Timothy, to Titus, or to Polycarp, as his fellow-presbyters in the Apostolic age. After writing his books, he went, according to tradition, into the West, where he became the Apostle of Gaul and the founder of the church in Paris. At that remarkable scene pictured by legend, when the Apostles came together from all parts of the world to the bedside of the dying mother of Christ, Dionysius came also among them, that he might have "the spectacle of that body

mate things but also in inanimate, whence some do affirm that by the virtue of a church, if any one entereth therein from devotion, his venial sins be forgiven. Again, the hands are thus held in cases of exorcism especially, as if the priest by the bodily act would put to flight and threaten the devil by the virtue of the consecration of his hands" (Durandus, *Rat. Div. Offic.*, II. 9, 16. Cf. *Symbolism of Churches and Church Ornaments*, Neale and Webb, p. 151).

[1] It has been generally assumed that the time of the Dionysian writings was the latter part of the fifth century or the earlier part of the sixth. But in recent years this date has been questioned, and his time carried back to the latter part of the fourth century. Harnack and others agree in this earlier date, but suppose that his writings have since undergone great modification. For a review of the discussion cf. *Dionysische Bedenken*, by Dräseke, in *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1897.

which was the beginning of life and the recipient of God." The teacher of Dionysius was also there, Hierothius by name, who, it is said, surpassed all others, except the Apostles, in his inspired utterances of praise and song, as if some divine power were making him its oracle.

Nothing is known of the life of the man who has played the rôle in ecclesiastical history of Dionysius the Areopagite. His personality was so identified with his thought that he may have preferred to submerge it, in order to the propagation of his peculiar philosophy. There is, however, an incident mentioned in his letter to Polycarp which may have an autobiographical value. From this letter it appears that Dionysius was a fellow-student with one Apollophanes in the Egyptian city of Heliopolis at the time of the passion, and both were witnesses of the eclipse of the sun and of the total darkness which attended the yielding up of the life upon the cross. At the moment when these portents took place, when both also were ignorant of the great tragedy in Jerusalem, Apollophanes, moved by some divine afflatus, exclaimed to his friend, "These events must be the accompaniments of some divine transaction."[1] The remark of Apollophanes has been reproduced in several versions. According to one of these, Apollophanes exclaimed, "It is a crisis in the affairs of heaven"; and Dionysius replied, "Either the God of nature suffers or the fabric of the world is broken up."[2] Or again, "Either the divinity suffers or sympathizes with some sufferer."[3] Or according to another version, "The unknown God is suffering in the flesh."[4] But each version contains the same idea, — the sympathetic connection between spirit and nature, which is one of the fundamental principles of the Dionysian philosophy. The inference is a simple one, that Dionysius, so called, was impressed by the narrative of the portents which accompanied the crucifixion and drew from it an argument in behalf of his

[1] *Epis.* viii., §§ 2, 3.

[2] Cf. Westcott, *Religious Thought in the West*, p. 155. "Aut Deus naturae patitur aut mundi machina dissolvitur."

[3] Ἢ τὸ θεῖον πάσχει, ἢ τὸ πασχόντι συμπάσχει.

[4] Ὁ ἄγνωστος ἐν σαρκὶ πάσχει θεός.

conviction, or it may have been a transition link between his heathen attitude and his Christian faith. The assumption by this unknown writer of the name Dionysius is in itself an epitome of the substance of his thought, — the connection of Athens and Jerusalem, the welding together of Greek speculation modified by Egyptian mysteriosophy with Christian devotion.

This unknown writer, who, for convenience, may be called Dionysius, was familiar with the Neoplatonic philosophy, the inner principle of which becomes the foundation of his system; he moves in the Christian sphere with freedom after his discovery that the Catholic theology and ritual might be easily adapted to the cherished principles of an earlier training. He accepts the Neoplatonic principle of mediations by means of heavenly potencies, constituted in grades descending from the highest to the lowest, until a grade is reached which, communicating with men in this lower world, superintends and inspires the process by which humanity is raised to share in the divine life and light. He accepts the principle that all divine truth must come by mediation, by impartation from the higher to the lower.[1] In some points his teaching has even a resemblance to that of Arius, as in his often-repeated affirmation that absolute truth, God as He is in Himself, cannot be known by man, who must be content to receive the knowledge of the divine under human limitations, adapted to his earthly intelligence. Upon this point he is most emphatic, that divine manifestations are not and have never been made directly or immediately by God to men. In evidence of this position, he adduces the words: "No man hath seen God at any time." But those other words of Christ, which underlie the Athanasian theology, he does not quote: "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father." All revelation must come through the mediation of celestial powers, who impart truth to men, in relativity, as they are able to receive it.[2] If any one should think to pass beyond the human limitation, or rashly attempt to gaze upon the reality, he would

[1] *De Coel. Hier.*, c. iv., § 3.

[2] *De Eccles. Hier.*, c. ii., § 3.

only be blinded by the glare and made incapable of vision. There is much in the writings of Dionysius as true and elevating as it is beautiful, but in this assumption of a revelation relative and not absolute, mediated and not direct, is concealed the motive that reconciled men to things as they were, and made the highest freedom and most real progress impossible. Its tendency was to subjugate humanity to the mediation of the visible church, in Eastern Christendom, as in the West the same result was accomplished by the assertion of the priesthood, which developed into the absolute power of the papacy.

But Dionysius has caught, too, that other principle for which the Neoplatonists were also struggling, — that the world is good. His treatise on the Celestial Hierarchy opens with these words, as the keynote of his special message, — "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above and cometh down from the Father of lights." It is further evident that, like the dying heathen philosophy, the range of his thought was taking in world relations, when he repeats its well-known formula, that "all things are from God and to God." At this point he makes his Christian departure. Where heathen teachers did not and could not follow him, and so failed to establish a religion, he invokes Jesus as the fatherly light, the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world, the source also of light by whom we have access to the Father. That principle of unity which Neoplatonism could not attain, centres in Jesus, running alike through all the hierarchies of heaven, filling and sustaining them all, ordering their gradations, but also ordering and inspiring the earthly hierarchies, and communicating to these also the same divine gift, in measure according to their rank, or as they are able to receive it. From this preamble, he turns to another ruling idea of his system, — that the divine light cannot illuminate men except as it is veiled in symbols. The physical creation has been designed by the Father's wisdom in order, through the inherent fitness of things, to become the mediator of spiritual light and truth. The ritual of the church and its grades of ministers are

of divine institution, an imitation of heavenly hierarchies, differing from them in this, that the earthly order deals with sacred pictures and material things that it may raise men to that spiritual meaning which is without type or symbol, as in the heavenly hierarchies. It is impossible, Dionysius repeats it, that the human mind should reach the immaterial or spiritual except through the mediation of the visible symbol, whose correspondence with the spiritual is divinely ordered, as when the beauty of visible things becomes a type and revelation of the invisible beauty, or the sweetness of odors perceptible by the senses a suggestive emblem of divine gifts, or the physical light an image of the heavenly light. The verbal expositions of truth correspond to an inward banquet of the soul; the graded ranks of the ministry speak of law and harmonious order in sacred things; the communion of the holy eucharist of participation in Jesus. These material symbols are given for the deification of men, according to human capacity; and by deification is meant, sharing in the life and fellowship of God; but they are also temporary, preparing for the sublimer grandeurs of the heavenly order.[1] Such is the preamble to the treatises of Dionysius on the Heavenly and the Earthly Hierarchies. It has a tone of authoritative conviction, as of a master conscious of possessing truth which the church of his time needed but did not yet possess, as if he were bringing to his age a message whose proclamation he felt sure would receive no doubtful welcome.

The treatise on the Heavenly Hierarchy requires here but a brief consideration; for though Dionysius abounds in eloquent exposition, as he dwells on the graded orders of celestial power, he cannot get beyond the limitations of his own or human ignorance.[2] The importance of the

[1] Cf. *De Eccles. Hier.* c. iv., § 3. In the treatise on Mystic Theology this thought is further developed, — that the symbolism of the ritual is a concession to human weakness, and even in this world is outgrown by those who are advanced in spiritual culture.

[2] "As though intoxicated with nature and given up to ecstasies, these men (Dionysius and others) ignored the ethical nature of God; and yet at the same time imagined themselves able to advance an infinitely more

treatise for the development of ritual lies in the assertion of the principle that heaven and earth are connected by a common life and common worship; that the church on earth is reproducing in its ministry and rites the sacred drama as it is performed by those who stand about the throne of God; always, of course, with the qualification, according to the lower capacities of human powers. In his speculations regarding those celestial intelligences which are higher than man, the mind of the pseudo-Dionysius was chiefly impressed with the mystic imagery of the Book of Ezekiel, the seraphim and cherubim of the Old Testament, and in the New Testament with those visions of the Book of Revelation in which are symbolized the glories and perfections of the upper world. He constituted in imagination the heavenly hierarchies by adding to angels and archangels, already familiar to his mind, the cherubim and seraphim of the Old Testament, and with these he combined the potencies alluded to in the Epistle to the Colossians, — thrones and dominions and principalities and powers. These, nine in all, he divided into groups of three, a sacred number, placing in the highest rank, in close proximity to God, seraphim and cherubim and thrones; next below these stood dominions, virtues, powers; and beneath these, principalities, archangels, and angels. The angels are the lowest in the scale and are commissioned to mediate with humanity, to hand down to the world the truth and light so far as they have received it. By the time that angels are reached in the heavenly hierarchy, there is a vast remove from Deity Himself, and the revelation which they make is meagre compared with the direct vision of those nearest the eternal throne. In the larger sense of the word 'angels' all the heavenly powers are included as a convenient way of speaking. But the angel of communication with the world stands in the lowest rank of the lowest grade of the heavenly hierarchy.

There were two sources from whence Dionysius drew in his arrangement of the heavenly hierarchy; one was Neo-

sublime conception of God" (Dorner, *Person of Christ*, Div. II., Vol. I., p. 157).

platonism, which conceived the going forth from God in an ever-decreasing degree of the divine life and capacity, until in the lowest order a being was found sufficiently below the higher powers, and yet sufficiently above man, to hold contact with the world of human existence which stands at an almost infinite remove from Deity. The other source was the Old Testament. He passed over the great age of Hebrew prophecy, when the "Word of God" came directly to the soul of the prophet, preferring the later phase of Jewish history, after the return from Babylon, when it was no longer the "Word of God," but an angel who brought the message the prophet was to proclaim. It was a feature of the age in which Dionysius lived, as it was of the age after the captivity, that there was no longer the "open vision"; the day of prophecy was spent, the day of commentators and mediators was at hand. But even so, the system of Dionysius was a vastly higher thing than Neoplatonism; for Jesus, who is the author and inspirer of all the hierarchies in heaven and earth, who is also coequal with the Father, is conceived as having become incarnate in this lower world, redeeming it from the evil of a remote insignificance and connecting it in close organic relationship with the highest. This one idea of the incarnation, which the Neoplatonist stubbornly refused to accept, gave the life and the unity to the scheme of Dionysius, that prevented it from degenerating into an empty abstraction.

The principle of mediation runs through the hierarchies as an organic law; to receive and to give is the function of spiritual life. Seraphim alone receive directly from the infinite source, and impart in turn to cherubim, so far as the latter can receive; and what cherubim can give is handed on to the thrones. From this higher threefold grade, the fire of divine life is imparted in reduced degree to the next grade in descent, and so on to the lowest. Virtues receive from dominations and bestow on powers; the powers connect through principalities with the lowest hierarchy, which in turn gives to archangels, and they to angels. This is the essence of hierarchy as Dionysius

defines it — "a supreme order, and wisdom and energy, in imitation of God, so far as is attainable, and fitted for the divine illuminations granted to it by God, in due proportion in order to the divine imitation."[1] Dionysius struggles in vain to define or to discriminate between the distinctive qualities of each threefold order in the heavenly hierarchy with this exception, that he finds an uniform law pervading all things: the lowest potency in each grade represents purification; the middle potency stands for illumination; and the highest for perfection, in the particular degree or capacity assigned to it. This law also he makes control the earthly hierarchies.

Before turning to the earthly hierarchy, two things may be noted in regard to these speculations for which Dionysius claimed the sanction of the Apostles, and under which claim they were received by the church down to the Reformation as having an equal authority with Scripture itself. They represent human speculation about the unknown and the unknowable, which has no clear warrant of ancient Hebrew prophecy, or of Christ and His Apostles. But they also filled up the void created by the dethronement of heathen deities, giving food for the spiritual imagination, peopling heaven with pure intelligences, symbolizing those higher virtues for which men strive but never entirely attain. The influence of these speculations about angels has been immense, but it is chiefly through poetry that the influence has been felt in later times. Dante referred to Dionysius as

> "That taper's radiance, to whose view was shown,
> Clearliest, the nature and the ministry
> Angelical."

Spenser and Milton more particularly have reproduced what Dionysius originated. In the woodcuts which illustrate the missals of the Middle Ages, angels are hovering over the rites of the earthly altar, as at their higher altar

[1] "Εστι μέν ἱεραρχία, κατ' ἐμέ, τάξις ἱερά, καὶ ἐπιστήμη, καὶ ἐνέργεια πρὸς τὸ θεοειδὲς ὡς ἐφικτὸν ἀφομοιουμένη, καὶ πρὸς τὰς ἐνδιδομένας αὐτῇ θεόθεν ἐλλάμψεις ἀναλόγως ἐπὶ τὸ θεομίμητον ἀναγομένη (*De Coel. Hier.*, c. iii., § 1).

they perform the transfigured ritual of heaven. In the Sarum Missal is the petition "*Supplices te rogamus, omnipotens Deus, jube haec perferri per manus sancti angeli tui in sublime altare tuum, in conspectu divinae majestatis tuae.*" In the Trisagion of the present English office, is also retained the angelic commemoration, "Therefore with angels and archangels and all the hosts of heaven." But it is also to be noted that the worship of angels never became a feature of the Catholic church. There are traces of it at the time when the worship of saints was becoming an established usage, but they soon disappeared. As God and Christ retreated into the background of the popular religion, it was Mary the Virgin, the confessors and martyrs, the heroes of the time, not angels or archangels, who won the confidence of humanity. The poet Lessing gave the reason why the angel, with his supernatural purity and intelligence, has never received the homage of the Catholic church; a fellow-man is dearer to the heart of man than any angel:

> "Denn, Daja, glaube mir, dem Menschen ist
> Ein Mensch noch immer lieber als ein Engel."[1]

There are also allusions in the New Testament that did not weigh with Dionysius as he constructed the heavenly hierarchies and fixed the place of man on earth beneath the angel. "Know ye not," says St. Paul, "that we shall judge the angels?" And again it is said of the transcendent majesty of human redemption, that it is "a thing which the angels desire to look into," as if there were here some greater and more glorious experience than angelic existence can reveal. To have had the darker experience of sin and a fall, and then to have risen, may conceal possibilities for humanity grander than those can know who have never been called to the conflict and victory with evil. It was one of the speculations of an early Gnostic theologian, that redeemed humanity would be raised in the world of æons above all other created beings, in consequence of its triumph over sin. The

[1] *Der Nathan der Weise*, 1 Aufz., 1 Auft.

opinion has also been advanced, in order to explain the existence of fallen angels, that they revolted when they learned that it was to be their mission to minister to humanity, since, when its consummation was accomplished, it was to appear more glorious and exalted than the angelic order. These considerations, which are out of place in the Dionysian scheme, may point to some defects in his system that will be more apparent hereafter.

The earthly hierarchy is the continuation of the heavenly, a ladder reaching down from heaven to earth on which angels are descending and by which it is divinely appointed that men should rise to the knowledge and possession of the life in God. The earthly corresponds to the heavenly hierarchy in its constitution, and is divided into three ranks or orders. The first or highest grade includes the three mysteries or sacraments: (1) baptism, (2) the eucharist, and (3) the chrism or anointing oil. In the second rank is the threefold ministry: (1) bishops, (2) presbyters, and (3) deacons. Beneath these, in the lowest rank, are (1) the catechumens, who are in training for the sacred rite of baptism; (2) the holy laity, who have been admitted to the divine communion; and (3) the monks, who, by the chrism, are initiated into a higher life and, so far as their receptivity allows, are being perfected in God.

Each of these threefold hierarchies is conceived as a supreme divine law, as the channel or receptacle of this divine wisdom, and as charged with the divine energy, each in its order or capacity, — of all which the end is assimilation to God. The same law pervades their operations as in the heavenly ranks; purification, illumination, and perfection is the method of each separate order. In baptism is the purification of the body and the soul from evil; in the communion of the eucharist is admission to the common life of God, so that men come therein to the knowledge of God; in the chrism there is perfection, symbolized by the perfume of the anointing oil, the latter deserving the highest place as representing more fully Christ, the anointed of God.

In the order of the ministry, the deacon (λειτουργός) superintends the process of purification, the priest (ἱερεύς) administers the eucharist (κοινωνία τέ καὶ σύναξις), which brings illumination, and to the bishop (ἱεράρχης) belongs the gift of perfecting the illuminated, for he alone consecrates the chrism which brings to perfection. In the lower ranks of the laity the catechumens are under the training of the deacon in order to purification, the holy laity are led by the priest to the illuminations, and to the monks alone of the three is given a special consecration by the chrism, in order to their perfection by a life of isolation from the world and by exclusive contemplation of divine things.

Sacraments, ministry, and laity are then alike included in the hierarchic order and energy; physical agencies, no less than human personalities, combine to the spiritual result. The term used for this combination of the sensuous or material with the spiritual is Mystery (μυστήριον), the Greek equivalent for the Latin *sacramentum*. The word 'mystery' was at this time used so vaguely that the exact number of the mysteries remained undetermined,[1] and might include the creeds or formulas of doctrine. By Dionysius the number of the mysteries was fixed at six, — baptism, the eucharist, the chrism or confirmation, ordination, consecration of monks, anointing of the dead. This arrangement was afterward modified in the Greek church, and the mysteries became seven in number by the omission of the consecration of monks and the introduction of marriage and penance. Dionysius has described in detail in his book on the Earthly Hierarchy the ceremonies connected with each mystery in order to its proper performance. A special supernatural importance attaches to each ritual act or slightest ceremonial variation; for the physical symbol is everywhere allied with the spiritual purpose, as if indispensably necessary to its accomplishment. Dionysius therefore becomes the founder of rit-

[1] "Die Zählung war sehr willkürlich; Mysterium war jedes Sinnliche, bei dem etwas Heiliges gedacht oder genossen werden sollte" (Harnack, *Grundriss*, etc., p. 173).

ualism. He embodied in his system the suggestions of his forerunners, the contributions of Cyril of Jerusalem and Cyril of Alexandria, and more particularly the deeper principles of Gregory of Nyssa, between whose thought and his own there is a striking similarity. The tendency of such a system was to grow continually more subtle and intricate by the additions of commentators, by the discovery of new correspondences between the physical and the spiritual, until the ritual became, like the Egyptian mysteries which it supplanted, an almost unintelligible performance, the key to which the priesthood was supposed to possess, but which in reality had been lost.

The teaching of the Two Hierarchies commended itself to the Catholic church, although the treatises of Dionysius were first utilized by the Monophysites, whose appeal to them created suspicion among the orthodox. But the system was so consonant with the prevailing tendencies of the age, it lent such lustre and significance to the ritual and to the clergy, that it could not fail to meet an universal response. But there are also features in the fuller thought of Dionysius which do not harmonize with what has been called the sacramental theology, either in that age or in subsequent periods. There are glimpses of a tendency purely spiritual, and not material or ecclesiastical, vistas opening up to the view some larger ranges of religious speculation which the popular mind could not follow. It is very significant, for example, that Dionysius almost invariably uses the human name of the Saviour even in his most exalted and sublimated appeals. It is *Jesus* who is coequal with the Father, *Jesus* who has created the hierarchies of heaven and earth, and it is the life and spirit of *Jesus* which ranges through them all, imparting their energy and validity, as though the name of Jesus were at once human and divine, the name at which every knee should bow. Another unexplained feature in his method, is his substitution of other designations for the clergy than the customary ones of bishops, priests or presbyters, and deacons. Again he insists upon the importance of holy life among the clergy almost in

Montanist or Donatist fashion, as an essential element in making the ritual expositions effective. For this is part of that life of Jesus diffused among the hierarchies, without which they lose their power. And still further, he magnifies the importance of homiletical expositions of the meaning of the sacred rites, to be made by the higher clergy, as if in their words alone resided the mystic efficacy through which the hearers are brought into union and communion with God. In this way he neutralizes in some measure the tendency in his system toward a mechanical theory of the sacraments that makes the physical act effective without the intelligent or conscious co-operation of the worshipper. This feature in the writings of Dionysius, which assigns a high importance to homiletical instruction in its appeal to the mind or conscience, appears in his comment on the eucharist, where he seems to intimate that the communion with God wherein lies illumination takes place in the sacrament before the distribution of the symbols of bread and wine.

In his view of the essential nature of symbolism, also, Dionysius stands by himself. The conception that the symbol expresses, more clearly than words can do, the deeper spiritual functions of God in the regeneration of the soul, whether it be true or not, is not the conception he adopts in his ritual expositions. Rather the symbol is obscure in itself, veiling the truth in darkness, until its clearer exposition is reached in language. This character of the symbol springs from the very nature of that process of emanation by which all things in the spiritual or the visible world have gone forth from God. Since this is conceived as a descending process, it reaches its lowest stage when the divine life is driven to express itself in corporeal or material forms. The visible creation is good and is filled with the divine life according to its capacity, but this capacity is, after all, so inadequate that visible things conceal the Deity as truly as they reveal Him. There is, according to Dionysius, in all this another purpose, serviceable to the church. The veil upon nature, or the interpretation of nature as an allegory,

prevents the profanations of the divine mysteries by the vulgar or the uninitiated. Only within the church, and by sacred expositions of which the clergy are capable by special divine illumination, is the veil withdrawn and the mystery of nature disclosed. Between this teaching and the interpretation of the ancient nature-worships, especially by the Egyptian priesthood, the resemblance is obvious. But at any rate it is a higher teaching than the *opus operatum* conception of the sacraments, which descends rapidly to magic, theurgy, and the lower aspects of religion without resistance or protest. Traces of this doctrine of Dionysius still linger about the Oriental liturgies, wherein they differ from the Latin, making them obscure to one who comes to them with Latin presuppositions.

From this view of the symbol or the veiled revelation of God in nature, the departure of Dionysius was easy in another direction, as when he teaches that to the spiritual enlightened soul the symbol is no longer necessary, but it gazes directly, without the aid of media, upon the divine reality. Even in his treatises on the Two Hierarchies he cannot suppress this conviction, though his object there is to commend the symbolical worship of the church. The splendor of the divine light is revealed without the symbol to men inspired, and their intellectual insight knows no concealment.[1] In their degree and according to their capacity, they resemble the celestial hierarchy, acted upon from within, no longer like the multitude who are moved by the things without. This doctrine is brought out more clearly and strongly in the treatise on Mystic Theology, whose object is to show that men may approach more closely to God in proportion as they escape from their dependence on the physical or bodily conditions, shunning all signs and symbols of the divine, in order to rise to the vision of the reality and the more intimate knowledge of God. A formal inconsistency like this would seem to indicate that Dionysius held to the distinction of the esoteric and the exoteric, — the one for the few enlightened souls, the other

[1] *De Eccles. Hier.* c. iv., § 5.

for the unintelligent multitude who were gathered within the church. And here again may be noted the influence of, or the coincidence with, the teaching of the later Greek philosophy, and the initiations of the Egyptian priesthood.

The merits and the deficiencies of Dionysius appear in their most striking form in his book on The Divine Names, in some respects the most important treatise in the later Greek theology, after the age of Cyril. It is a profoundly speculative work, but does not profess to be so; rather, it starts with the explicit statement that nothing can be known of the names of God or of the nature of God except through Scripture. The name of God stands for the revelation of the divine character, as when it was asked, What is Thy name? with the answer, Wherefore dost thou ask after my name?

"There are many names of God, as when they introduce Him, saying, I am that I am, — life, light, God, truth, or as when those who are wise with the wisdom of God, raise to Him, the Maker of all things, a hymn of praise from all created things, as the good, the beautiful, as the wise, the beloved, as God of gods and Lord of lords, as the Holy of holies, as eternal, He who is, as the author of the ages, as the giver of life, as wisdom, as mind, as Word, as knowing and as having in highest degree all treasures of all knowledge; as power and as ruler, as king of kings, as the ancient of days, but not aged, or mutable; as salvation, justice, sanctification, and redemption; in His greatness surpassing all things and as subtility in the air. And they also say of Him that He exists in minds, and in souls and bodies and in heaven and in earth, and at once the same in the same, in the world, around the world, above the world, supercelestial, supersubstantial, sun, star, fire, water, spirit, dew and cloud, even the stone, the rock, all things which are, and nothing of the things which are."[1]

But these names of God also conceal while they reveal. The divine existence transcends all existence: His unity, which it is beyond the power of the mind to conceive, transcends all intelligence; His goodness cannot be expressed by words, His essence is above essence, His mind inconceivable, and His word cannot be uttered. He must be conceived as the negation of word and mind and name, His existence has no analogy in other existence. He is

[1] *De Div. Nom.* c. i., § 6.

the author of being in all and yet Himself without being because above all being.[1] But it is characteristic of the method of the book on The Divine Names, that he no longer celebrates the ritual of the Hierarchy, as the mode of coming to the knowledge of God. He has risen now to a height where spirit must meet spirit alone. Prayer is the means of approach to God, and this not because God is absent or at a distance from us, but because through prayer we are present to God in mind and spirit: not so much that God approaches us, as that we realize His presence, and thus draw nigh to God.[2]

The treatise on The Divine Names so magnifies and as it were revels in the immanence of God, from whom all things proceed, in whom they exist, sharing in the divine goodness and beauty and wisdom, that it becomes a serious question, how evil can exist at all in such a divine creation. Dionysius boldly faces the question[3] by denying its existence altogether. Evil is simply the absence of the good: it is defect of existence, privation, want, feebleness or frailty; but it has no positive being and in the nature of the case cannot have, for all existing things or entities are from God, who is goodness and love, beauty and truth. There can be no rival power to His power which could impart actual existence to evil. The cause of all things is good; therefore the principle and end of all things, even those having the marks of evil, things impotent or infirm, is also good.[4] Evil as evil is not an entity; does not exist in things, not even in demons, but is rather lack of power, imbecility; for even they seek good in so far as they desire to be, or to exist and to know, but through defect of the true appetite they do not reach the good.[5] The familiar comparison is that of cold, which is the want of heat, or of darkness, which is the want of light. When the day darkens at its close, nothing is added to what existed before, but something has disappeared. And so when man is withdrawn from the world, since all life

[1] *De Div. Nom.* c. i., § 1.
[2] *De Div. Nom.* c. iii.
[3] *De Div. Nom.* c. iv.
[4] *De Div. Nom.* c. iv., § 31.
[5] *De Div. Nom.* c. iv., § 34.

comes from the eternal life, and since by participation in the divine life alone, here and everywhere, are all forms of life sustained, it follows that those in whom the life here has been deficient, who have failed through weakness to reap the true results of life, shall return again to the one life and again become alive.[1]

We have here, in sharp contrast, the difference between the Greek anthropology and the Latin. In the one, man appears as weak and frail, and the Fall is the result of human feebleness; in the other, man appears not only as weak, but as vicious; in the one, he is presented as the object of the divine compassion, as making by his situation a touching appeal to the divine aid and mercy, which responds readily in the fulness of its power; in the other, he is an object of the divine condemnation, because of his self-willed and vicious purpose, nor can he be a recipient of the divine mercy, until some obstacle has been overcome which prevents his immediate reception into the divine favor. According to Dionysius, there is no obstacle, and no atonement; the sacrifice offered in worship is an oblation of gratitude and thanksgiving; there is no original sin in the Latin or Augustinian conception of the phrase. The failure of man to see or attain the good is attributable to the freedom of the will, not to the lack of freedom; and the remoter cause of the departure of the will from rectitude, is weakness which the divine goodness aims to strengthen, or ignorance which the divine enlightenment aims to overcome.

It is among the consequences of the Dionysian system, that it so harmonizes man with his natural environment and with God, as to reduce any contradiction in life to a nullity. The stimulus to struggle is weakened, as well as the power to subdue the forces hostile to his well-being. The history of the Western church was one of prolonged antagonism between the spiritual and the secular, between church and state, between man and outward nature, in which an evil agency was believed to be active, if not supreme. But in the East there was for the most

[1] *De Div. Nom.* c. vi., § 34.

part harmony in the relations between church and state. Only when the state proposed to take away the images, did the monkish element rise in fanatic opposition. And again, the Dionysian teaching, that in contemplation and in prayer does man rise above the ritual and come by devotion to a knowledge of God which the intellect cannot attain, had also its effect in elevating the men of contemplation, the monks, to the high places of honor in the church, although they still remained in the ranks of the laity. In the West there was bitter and continual rivalry between the episcopate and the monastery, the victory leaning now to one side, now to the other. But there was no such antagonism in the East. The holy laity who had received consecration as monks, and who by prayer contemplated the divine reality, constitute the sacred class out of whom the bishops are chosen, as it is becoming that those should be, who are to preside over the worship of the people.

It does not, indeed, follow that the Dionysian teaching is responsible for the stagnation which has characterized the Eastern church; for this immobility, this lack of progress, may be partly owing to other causes. Unlike the West, the Empire of Constantinople did not receive the influx of a new people, who were ultimately to become the founders of a higher civilization, and who came bringing with them a native stock of endowment, quite as valuable as the training they were to receive at the hands of the Latin church. Nor was the West shut in by the fanatical adherents of a lower religion like Islam, who were incapable of conversion, and on whom the human appeals of Christianity made no impression. Under happier auspices, the teaching of Dionysius, representing so universally the spirit of the Eastern church, might have led to other results. As it was, however deficient that teaching may have been in achieving the true psychology of man, or in stimulating his powers to their full development, yet in its doctrine of God it rose to a height which the Latin church never equalled. It got rid of the idea of the creation as evil, or as held in bondage to an evil

power; it presented God as the source of unity, and though, in His inmost essence, He was still represented as incomprehensible, yet the devout mind could trace the centripetal movement of all the lines of activity to His central being, in whom "all the radii of the vast circle of life converge." It was no slight result to have attained this conclusion. And again the ritual system of Dionysius stood to his own age, as well as to subsequent times, in place of those richer modern developments, which it lacked any longer the power to create, — poetry and painting, music, science, and the healing art, substitutes to the modern world for the mysterious ceremonial of the altar.

It was the system of Dionysius also which did for the Western church a work it was unable to do for itself. Not until the ninth century, when his books were translated into Latin by John Scotus Erigena, did the influence of this Eastern mysticism begin to tell upon Latin thought. The Latin liturgy had already received its form and character, and Latin theology had been developed upon an Augustinian basis, when the poetry of Dionysius came as an enlarging, elevating, and softening spell upon Latin severity and its crude literalism. More, even, than Augustine was Dionysius held in repute by the schoolmen in the Middle Ages. To Aquinas and to other commentators upon his books, he contributed that charm not indigenous to the Latin mind, which it owes to its despised rival of the East. Through Aquinas his influence passed into the soul of Dante, thus becoming the foundation of modern culture, ever and anon reappearing, when life grows dull and sordid, to reinvest it with a diviner meaning. But wherever his influence was felt, it carried with it a twofold result; on the one hand it increased the interest in the ritual, and on the other it prepared the mystics of the later Middle Ages for the emancipation from ritual observance, or the relegation of it to harmless subordination.[1]

[1] The best edition of the works of Dionysius is contained in Migne, *Patr. Gr.*, Vol. III., followed in Vol. IV. by the Commentary of Maximus. Among his disciples in the Latin church after John Scotus Erigena, who

first translated his writings about the middle of the ninth century, were Peter the Lombard, Hugo of St. Victor, Robert Grossetête, Bishop of Lincoln, Albert the Great, and Dionysius the Carthusian. On the indebtedness of Thomas Aquinas, cf. Migne, III., Obs. XII. 90, for a list of passages cited by Thomas from his writings (ut sicut Doctor Angelicus ex illo sole magnum sapientiae lumen accepit). The study of Dionysius was cherished by the mystics of the fourteenth century, and was also cultivated by the scholars of the Renaissance; not, however, for the purpose of quickening an interest in the declining fortunes of the Mediæval ritual, but for his philosophy of nature and his fusion of the natural with the spiritual. In the fifteenth century, Dean Colet, of St. Paul's, published paraphrases of the Hierarchies with comments (Eng. Trans., 1869). In addition to Bishop Westcott's admirable study of Dionysius in his *Relig. Thought in the West*, cf. articles in *Dict. Chris. Biog.*, with a list of the literature, and Herzog, *Real Encyc.* See also Kanakis, J., *Dion, der Areop, nach seinem Character als Philosoph.*, 1881.

CHAPTER IV

THE LORD'S SUPPER[1]

THE last half of the fourth century was the beginning of an age of ritual activity, in the course of which the Lord's Supper was transformed into the Mass of the Roman church, or into the imposing drama of the Oriental Mystery. To this process Cyril of Jerusalem, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, and Chrysostom contributed. The doctrine of Cyril of Alexandria regarding the incarnation also influenced the development of the sacrament of the altar, combining with a mysteriosophy, as it has been called, to which Syria and Egypt contributed. During this period creative theological activity declined; the mind of the church became weary of incessant controversy, and sceptical of the power of the human reason to attain the truth. For reason was substituted tradition, to which the appeal was henceforth taken; while ritual became to the devout imagination a substitute for philosophy, science, art, poetry, and literature.

[1] For the earlier sources of the liturgies, cf. *Apos. Cons.*, Bks. II., VII., VIII.; Cyril, *Mystagogic Catechism;* the writings of Chrysostom, in Bingham, *Chris. Antiq.*, Bk. XIV.; Dionysius, *De Eccles. Hier.* in Migne, *Patrol. Gr.*, Vol. II.; the collections of liturgies in Assemani and Daniel; Brightman, *Liturgies, Eastern and Western*, Vol. I., *The Eastern Liturgies;* Swainson, *The Greek Liturgies;* art. *Liturgies*, in *Dict. Chris. Antiq.*, with full bibliography; Renaudot, *Liturgiarium Orientalium Collectio;* Goar, *Euchologion, sive Rituale Graecorum;* Bunsen, *Analecta ante-Nicaena*, Vol. III., and *Hippolytus and his Age*, Vol. IV.; Neale, *His. of the Holy Eastern Church, Introd.*, Vols. I., II.; Palmer, *Origines Liturgicae;* Freeman, *Principles of Divine Service*, Koestlin, *Geschichte des christlichen Gottesdienstes;* Harnack, Th., *Christliche Gemeindegottesdienst;* Probst, *Liturgie d. drei ersten christlichen Jahrhunderte;* Harnack, *Gesch. d. altchristl. Literatur*, Vol. I.; Steitz, *Die Abendmahlslehre der griechischen Kirche in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung;* Gass, *Symbolik der griechischen Kirche;* Höfling, *Die Lehre der ältesten Kirche vom Opfer im Leben und Cultus der Christen.*

The two forms of worship which had existed from the first in close relationship were gradually separated and followed independent careers. The homiletic service, consisting of prayer and praise, the reading of Scripture and exhortation, was mainly developed in the monasteries, especially after the introduction of the Horæ, when each day, no less than the year, was stamped with the purpose of devotion. Thus was produced the Breviary of the Roman church, the *Horologium* of the Greek church. Beyond the adaptation of this type of worship to the growing calendar of the Christian year, and the introduction of the writings of church Fathers for the purpose of edification along with Scripture, for which the early church also contains the precedent, no new principle was introduced into the homiletic worship. This type of worship was the expression of religious experience in its uniform as well as its changing phases, bringing also the conscience and the intellect into relation with the service of God. Its tendency was toward a rich and dense intricacy of detail, which involved the necessity for reduction in order to practical availability. As the reservoir of religious experience, the Breviary was filled with legends and miraculous stories, reflecting the spirit of the age. The recitation of the Psalter, at first one of its leading features, and also the use of Scripture, were to a large extent superseded by what must then have seemed the more interesting extracts from the homilies of the Fathers or the Lives of the Saints. Whatever its defects, and they were many and great, the Breviary stood as a distinct mode of worship, in its essential characteristic recognized at the Reformation as of the highest importance. It became therefore the prevailing order of worship in the Protestant churches, leading to the subordination of the Lord's Supper. The English and the Lutheran churches retained more of the forms of the Breviary than did the Reformed church, where worship was confined to prayer, praise, Scripture reading, and the sermon, while the recitation of the Creed, the Psalter, and of the Lord's prayer was omitted. But in the extemporaneous prayer of the Reformed church

and in the sermon is still retained the continuation of the method which gave the Breviary its interest and its power. The expression of a living religious experience with the adaptation of religion to the passing incidents of life thus again became an important element of Christian worship.[1]

The eucharist was the service for the people as a whole and in their collective capacity. It was developed by the bishops in their parishes to meet the needs and impress the imagination of those who had neither time nor disposition for the cultivation of a subjective or inward piety. It represented the "Christ for us" rather than the "Christ in us." After the sixth century, the term 'liturgy,' which in the early church included both forms of worship, was restricted to the eucharist alone. In order to measure the extent and the depth of the transformation of the eucharist, it is necessary to dwell for a moment on the worship of the early church in the first three centuries.

I

The Lord's Supper was at first organically related to an institution known as the *Agape* or Love-feast. A certain obscurity still hangs about the agape, some points relating to it being undetermined; but the main point is clear, that the eucharist was associated and in some places identified with it, as the ordinary evening meal. The first step in the transformation of the Lord's Supper was its separation from the agape, and its transference from the evening to the morning, a change accomplished by the time of Justin Martyr or about the middle of the second century. But the agape still continued to be a social Christian feast, observed in different ways and, as at Alexandria in

[1] Cf. Art. *Breviary*, in *Dict. Chris. Antiq.*, and in Herzog, *R. E.*; the *Breviaries* of Salisbury and Aberdeen, the Quignonian, Mozarabic, and Roman; Palmer, *Origines Liturgicae; Tracts for the Times*, Vol. III.; Freeman, *Principles of Divine Service;* works on the *Book of Common Prayer* by Proctor, Cardwell, Luckock, Daniel, Stephens, Huntington, W. R., and others; Kliefoth, *Liturgische Abhandlungen;* Richter, *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des sechszehnten Jahrhunderts;* Jacobi, *Die Liturgik des Reformatoren;* Lohe, *Agende für christliche Gemeinden des lutherischen Bekenntnisses.*

the third century, still connected with or followed by the eucharist. The last stage in its history is marked by the action of councils in the latter part of the third and during the fourth century, prohibiting its celebration in the churches and finally suppressing it altogether. Not until this had been accomplished was the way fully open to substitute another conception of the Lord's Supper which became the basis of the Catholic liturgies. But the agape did not disappear without leaving traces behind of its hold upon the popular sentiment. In the candles which blaze upon the altar in the full light of day, there may be the reminder, the protest also, it may be, of the time when candles were required for the consecrated evening meal. In the simple ceremony of saying Grace at meals survives the prayer of the earlier usage in the celebration of the eucharist, when the spirit of Christ's command was perpetuated in the power of simplicity, This do, in remembrance of me.

The agape was not an institution devised or created by the early church, but must be regarded as the continuation as well as the commemoration of Christ's last supper with His disciples. It is first mentioned by St. Paul[1] (1 Cor. xi.), who seeks to correct the abuses of the rite generated by the unspiritual mind, which resolved it into a mere occasion for satisfying hunger with no appreciation of its sacramental purpose. But St. Paul did not propose its abolition because of the abuse, but enforced its spiritual character by giving to the church of Corinth an account of its original institution. He also endeavored to regulate that other form of Christian worship, the homiletic service of prayer and praise and exhortation, where the prophets introduced disorder in their eagerness to speak; but he did not propose the suppression of the prophetic office in the interest of orderly administration.

The account of the Lord's Supper which is given in the *Didache* is a description of the agape:

"Now concerning the Eucharist, thus give thanks: *first concerning the cup.* We thank Thee, our Father, for the holy vine of David Thy

[1] Cf. also 2 Peter, ii. 13; Jude, 12.

servant which Thou hast made known to us through Jesus Thy servant; to Thee be the glory forever. *And concerning the broken bread;* We thank Thee, our Father, for the life and knowledge which Thou hast made known to us through Jesus, Thy servant; to Thee be the glory forever. Just as this broken bread was scattered over the hills and having been gathered together became one, so let Thy church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy kingdom; for Thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ forever. But let no one eat or drink of your Eucharist except those baptized into the Lord's name; for in regard to this the Lord hath said: Give not that which is holy unto the dogs.

"*Now after ye are filled* thus do ye give thanks: We thank Thee, holy Father, for Thy holy name, which Thou hast caused to dwell in our hearts; and for the knowledge and faith and immortality, which Thou hast made known to us through Jesus Thy servant; to Thee be glory forever. Thou, Almighty Master, didst create all things for Thy name's sake: both food and drink Thou didst give to men for enjoyment, in order that they might give thanks to Thee. But to us Thou hast graciously given spiritual food and drink and eternal life through Thy servant. Before all things we thank Thee that Thou art powerful; to Thee be glory forever. Remember, Lord, Thy Church, to deliver it from every evil and to make it perfect in Thy love, and gather it from the four winds, the sanctified, into Thy Kingdom which Thou hast prepared for it; for Thine is the power and glory forever. Let Grace come and let this world pass away. Hosanna to the Son of David! Whoever is holy let him come: Whoever is not let him repent. Maranatha. Amen. *But permit the prophets to give thanks as much as they will.*"

In the Ignatian Epistles the eucharist is identified with the agape: "Let that be deemed a proper eucharist which is administered by the bishop or by one to whom he has entrusted it. . . . It is not lawful without the bishop either to baptize or to celebrate a love-feast."[1] The allusion in the Epistle of Pliny to Trajan is indefinite; the time is not given, but the language describes the agape; the Christians were accustomed to meet on a stated day, before sunrise, when they sang a hymn to Christ as to a god, taking a vow, also, to abstain from all evil practices. Then they separated, and again they met for the purpose of

[1] In the Longer Greek Recension this passage is amplified and the distinction made between them: "It is not lawful without the bishop either to baptize or to offer or to present sacrifice, or to celebrate a love-feast" (*Ad Smyr.* c. viii.).

taking food of an ordinary and harmless character.[1] The first intimation of the Lord's Supper as a rite distinct from the agape is contained in the *Apology* of Justin Martyr about the middle of the second century; but whether Justin is describing the usage at Rome, or in Palestine, is uncertain. He does not mention the agape, but in the account which he gives of the worship, the eucharist follows a service at which the Scriptures were read, prayers were offered, and there was a sermon or exhortation.

"On the day called Sunday, all who live in the city or in the country gather together to one place, and the memoirs of the Apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits; then, when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs and exhorts to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray, and, as we before said, when our prayer is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings according to his ability, and the people assent by saying Amen. And there is a distribution to each, and a participation of that over which thanks have been given, and to those who are absent a portion is sent by the deacons. And they who are well to do and willing, give what each thinks fit, and what is collected is deposited with the president, who succors the orphans and widows and those in sickness or want, the prisoners and the strangers among us."[2]

Justin has also left another account of the eucharist, where it follows the baptism of a catechumen, who is brought to the place where those called the brethren are assembled, when prayers are offered "for ourselves and the baptized person, and for all others in every place. The prayers ended, we salute one another with a kiss:

"There is then brought to the president or leader among the brethren bread and a cup of wine mixed with water; and he, taking them, gives praise and glory to the Father of the universe through the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and offers thanks at considerable length for our being considered worthy to receive these things. And when he has concluded the prayers and thanksgiving, all the people express assent by saying Amen. And when the presi-

[1] "Quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire, carmenque Christo quasi deo secum invicem . . . quibus peractis morem sibi discedendi fuisse, rursusque coëundi ad capiendum cibum, promiscuum tamen atque innoxium" (*Epis.* x. 96).

[2] *Apol.* c. lxvii.

dent has given thanks and the people have expressed assent, those who are called by us deacons give to each of those present to partake of the bread and wine mixed with water, over which the thanksgiving was pronounced, and to those who are absent they carry away a portion."[1]

The reasons for the transference of the eucharistic service from the evening to the morning are obscure. It may have been that the prohibition of secret societies by Trajan was a motive for the change, but other motives must have combined toward this result which are not given. It may have been that for a while and in some places the agape was discontinued, but it was still observed in North Africa in the time of Tertullian.[2] In the account which he has given in his *Apology*, it appears as a service complete in itself, having an eleemosynary character, but revealing no trace of its earlier connection with the Lord's Supper. So, also, at Rome, in the earlier part of the third century, according to the recently recovered Canons of Hippolytus, the agape was kept as a charitable feast. Beyond its mention in these Canons in the same connection with the eucharist, there is no trace of any other affiliation between them. But the careful provision there made for the orderly observance of the agape points to the motive which had led to its separation from the eucharist. Fear of scandal, the base insinuation of heathen suspicions, actual abuses, inability of the Christian people themselves to observe the divine injunction, and thus rightly keep the feast in remembrance of Christ, were among the potent causes which led first to the separation of the eucharist from the supper, and then to the final suppression of the agape.[3]

[1] *Apol.* c. lxv. [2] *Apol.* c. xxxix. Cf. Cyprian, *Epis.* lxii., c. 16.

[3] "Si agape fit vel coena ab aliquo pauperibus paratur κυριακῇ tempore accensus lucernae, praesente episcopo surgat diaconus ad accedendum. Episcopus autem oret super eos et eum qui invitavit illos. Et necessaria est pauperibus εὐχαριστία quae est in initio missae. Missos autem faciat eos, ut separatim recedant, antequam tenebrae oboriantur. Psalmos recitent antequam recedant.

"Edant bibantque ad satietatem, neque vero ad ebrietatem, sed in divina praesentia cum laude Dei.

"Ne quis multum loquatur neve clamet, ne forte vos irrideant, neve sint

In the time of Clement of Alexandria, nearly contemporaneous with the time of the Canons of Hippolytus, the agape still maintained its original character as the form in which the eucharist was celebrated. Clement makes no distinction between them. His book, *The Instructor*, is based upon the principle that in the Lord's Supper the great Teacher was giving the model of every meal; with which also agree the words of St. Paul, "Whether ye eat or drink, do all to the glory of God." The agape in Alexandria was not, as in Rome, a supper for the poor, but the evils accompanying it sprang from an opposite character: it was a banquet of the rich, and its simplicity and purity were threatened by the variety and richness of the food. Hence the agape becomes Clement's text for a dissertation on the right conduct of life; he quotes St. Paul's condemnation of the abuses caused by not discerning the Lord's body, but, like St. Paul, he does not propose the abolition of the evening meal, seeking rather for its purification, till it reaches the high standard set by Christ.[1] From Clement's account, it may be inferred that the agape, or Lord's Supper, was kept weekly in the churches on the evening of the Lord's day, and also daily in private houses.[2] In the latter case, where

scandalo hominibus, ita ut in contumeliam vertatur qui vos invitavit cum appareat, vos a bono ordine aberrare.

"Si quis viduis coenam parare vult, curet, ut habeant coenam et ut dimittantur, antequam sol occidat" (cc. xxxii., xxxiii., xxxiv., xxxv., *Die Canones Hippolyti*, von Dr. P. H. Achelis, in *Texte u. Untersuch.*, B. VI., H. 4. Cf. also *Apos. Cons.* II. 28).

[1] *Paedag.*, II. c. 1.

[2] *Paedag.*, II. 1, and II. 10; *Strom.* VII. 7. For a discussion of the subject, cf. Bigg, *Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, pp. 102-106: "All that Clement says upon this subject is of the highest value to those who wish to recast for themselves a faithful image of the church life of the end of the second century. But of all his phrases, the most important are those which assure us that the ordinary evening meal of a Christian household was in a real sense an agape. It was preceded by the same acts of worship; it was blessed by a thanksgiving; it was a true Eucharist. The house father is the house priest. The highest act of Christian devotion is at the same time the simplest and most natural. Husband, wife, and child, the domestic slave, and the invited guest gathered round the domestic board to enjoy with thankfulness the good gifts of God, uplifting their hearts in filial devotion, expanding them in brotherly love

no bishop or presbyter could have been present, the head of the household must have presided at the feast.

The agape continued to be held, until after the middle of the fourth century, in the West as a charitable supper for the poor;[1] in the East, at Alexandria, as an ordinary evening meal with which the Lord's supper was connected. But the evils which waited upon it, even when the admission to the rite was more carefully guarded, as by the Catechumenate, must have greatly increased when the heathens were flocking into the church without any adequate preparation. The rise of monasticism also must have generated an influence hostile to its continuance in the East.[2] After the middle of the fourth century, its observance in the churches was forbidden by the influential Council of Laodicea (Can. 28).[3] The prohibition coincides with the new age of ritual activity, which was bringing in a stately ceremonial. An incongruity was felt between the archaic simplicity of the primitive supper and the solemnity and splendor of the new churches. But opinion was still divided. The Synod of Gangra, in the latter part of the fourth century, reflects the sentiment in its favor: "If any one despises those who in the faith solemnize the agape, and for the honor of the Lord invite their brethren to it, and will take no part in these invitations because he lightly esteems the matter, let him be anathema" (Can. 11). The custom of

and kindness. To us the word Eucharist has become a term of ritual, whose proper meaning is all but obsolete. To the Greek it was still a word of common life, thanksgiving — the grateful sense of benefits received, of good gifts showered by the good Father on mind and heart and body. 'He that eateth eateth unto the Lord and keepeth Eucharist to God . . . so that a religious meal is an Eucharist (*ὡς εἶναι τὴν δικαίαν τροφὴν εὐχαριστίαν*)'" (p. 105). Cf. Spitta, *Die urchristlichen Traditionen über Ursprung und Sinn des Abendmahls*, 1893, Band I., for a valuable discussion of the words of institution given in the Gospels and by St. Paul; also of the agape and the conception of sacrifice held in early church.

[1] Cf. Augustin, *Con. Faustum*, XX. 20; *Confess.*, VI. 2; also *Epis.* xxii., where he gives his reasons for suppressing the feast, especially as kept at funerals.

[2] Even Tertullian when he became a Montanist became averse to the agape; cf. *De Jejun*, c. xvii.

[3] Cf. *Apos. Cons.*, Can. 3.

receiving the communion fasting, which may be owing in part to a protest against the agape, was sanctioned at the Synod of Hippo in 393: "The sacrament of the altar shall always be celebrated fasting, except on the anniversary of its institution, *Coena Domini*" (Holy Thursday). With this injunction there went also prohibition of meals in the churches, unless for bishops and clergy or when necessary for the refreshment of guests; but to these meals the people were not to be admitted (Can. 28, 29). In the fifth century the agape, as the form of the Lord's Supper, still existed; but it had become an exception to the prevailing custom of holding the eucharist: "There are several cities and villages in Egypt," says Socrates, "where, contrary to the usages established elsewhere, the people meet together on Sabbath (Saturday) evening and, although they have dined previously, partake of the mysteries" (*H. E.*, VII. 19).[1] The agape was finally prohibited in the Second Trullan Council (692), but how deep had been its hold on the popular affection is seen in the custom in the Oriental church, which still prevails, of distributing to the people, in connection with the eucharist, bread which has been blessed, but not consecrated upon the altar.[2]

II

The agape possesses a special importance because it is the commentary on the Lord's Supper, contemporaneous with its institution. It tells us how the early generations of Christian believers interpreted the words, "This is my body, Do this in remembrance of me." In the evening meal, at the close of the day, the first disciples

[1] This statement is confirmed by Sozomen in his important enumeration of the differences in ecclesiastical usage in the fifth century: "The Egyptians in the neighborhood of Alexandria, and the inhabitants of Thebais, hold their religious meetings on the Sabbath (Saturday), but do not participate of the mysteries in the manner usual among Christians in general; for after having eaten and satisfied themselves with food of all kinds, in the evening, making their oblations, they partake of the mysteries" (*H. E.*, V. 22).

[2] For the history of the agape, cf. articles in Herzog, *R. E.*; *Dict. Chris. Antiq.*; Binterim, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, II., Pt. II., pp. 3 ff.

met together, praying over the bread and the cup, eating and drinking in remembrance of the Master. As He had eaten of the food which the earth supplies for human sustenance in a spirit of consecration to the will of His Father, so His disciples had at their command the same food which had nourished the body of Christ. If it were eaten in His spirit, whose meat and drink was to do the Father's will who had sent Him, then the food of common life, the bread and the wine, were transmuted by faith into elements that ministered also to spiritual life, and made them one in body and spirit with Christ.

But there were difficulties to be encountered in the early church, which it required an effort to overcome, in order to keep this spiritual feast. The ascetic mood which despises the body, as a hindrance to the spirit, or a prison house in which the spirit is confined, was widespread in the ancient world and was destined to change the simple faith of the first disciples. An exaggerated one-sided spiritualism characterized the age, springing from its philosophy and affecting the best and noblest characters of the time. It may be felt in the *Meditations* of Marcus Aurelius, or in the *Thoughts* of Epictetus, as a transcendental mood which regards the union of body and soul as an accident, bringing with it evils only to be surmounted by the renunciation of the body and, as far as possible, of the visible world. On the other hand, this same mood begot a reaction toward Epicureanism tending to promote the cultivation of the body and the gratification of the senses, and doubtful of any higher reality. While the church felt the influence of these attitudes of thought and life in the world of the time, yet in neither of these attitudes is to be found the supreme difficulty confronting the Christian mind. It was the Gnostic teachers, the Docetists, who brought home to the church most closely the evil tendency, that not only made a true eucharist impossible, but resolved Christ Himself into a transcendental dream. The denial of a human body to the Saviour might not have seemed so dangerous an error, or might have been more easily refuted if it had not been for the

belief in the resurrection, that made it impossible to point to the tomb or the grave as the visible evidence that Christ had once possessed an actual body and was not merely the manifestation of some celestial intelligence. But no stone marked the spot where He was buried; there was no cultus of the tomb. The attitude of the first disciples, who stood gazing up into heaven for the body of their Master, was typical of the earlier church; and to this mood Docetism could appeal with force when the words of consolation spoken by the angel no longer availed: "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." When the belief in the speedy return of the Saviour in visible form faded away, as was the case in the second century, the eucharist became its substitute, henceforth the object of the devotion and reverence that would otherwise have centred in a sacred tomb. Although He had risen and ascended, yet His body was still on earth, for the material elements composing that body were still furnished to His disciples in the memorial supper; as when He gave them the bread and said: "Take, eat, this is my body."

Ignatius, the bishop of Antioch, in the early part of the second century, was the first to attach a doctrinal significance to the Lord's Supper. His motive was to resist Docetism, the fear of which runs through his Epistles, as an error fatal to the Christian life or the existence of the church. So important was the eucharist in the thought of Ignatius and so strenuously does he present it as the bond of faith and Christian communion, that at times it seems to have been his chief motive in writing, to urge obedience to the bishop as the means of securing the right observance of the Lord's Supper. Thus his crowning argument against the Docetists and their denial of a real body to the Saviour, lies in pointing to the bread and wine in the eucharist, by which believers feed upon the body of Christ as the bread of immortality. The Lord's Supper is the evidence that Christ possessed an actual body. These

false teachers abstain from keeping the feast and the reason for their abstention is because they do not confess the eucharist to be the body of Christ (*Ad Smyr.* c. vi.). To keep with the bishop is also to hold by the eucharist, which it was the bishop's peculiar function to administer (c. viii.).

The teaching of Ignatius regarding the bread and wine has been sometimes interpreted as the first indication of the coming belief in transubstantiation. But although this comparatively late dogma can make use of the language of Ignatius, yet the teaching of Ignatius does not imply the later meaning. Indeed, his words can only be explained on the principle that the material food which nourished the body of Christ is still with us as the food of life, and that by the consecration of this food through the remembrance of Christ, eating and drinking the bread and wine in His spirit, our bodies become the same with His body, or, in other words, we feed upon His body and drink His blood. Thus he remarks in bold unqualified language: "I desire the bread of God, the heavenly bread, the bread of life which is the flesh of Jesus Christ; . . . I desire the drink of God, namely His blood, which is incorruptible love and eternal life" (*Ad Rom.* c. vii.). The principle underlying the thought of Ignatius is again revealed in another passage, where metaphor and reality are distinguished while they are combined, as, when referring to his approaching martyrdom he exclaims: "I am the wheat of God, and let me be ground by the teeth of the wild beasts, that I may be found the pure bread of Christ" (*Ad Rom.* c. iv.). The language of Ignatius has not hardened into a formula. Beneath it we may detect the subtle process of the spiritual imagination.

Similar language, with a corresponding freshness of spiritual apprehension, is found in the *Didache*, in the allusion to "the broken bread which was once scattered over the hills and having been gathered together has become one" (c. ix.); or in the consciousness of the analogy between earthly and heavenly food: "Food and drink Thou didst give to men for enjoyment, in order that they might give thanks to Thee; but to us Thou hast graciously

given spiritual food and drink and eternal life" (c. x.). Nor does Justin Martyr go beyond this teaching, although he gives it in condensed form, without the statement of the process on which it rests: "For not as common bread and common drink do we receive these; but in like manner as Jesus Christ our Saviour, having been made flesh by the word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so likewise have we been taught that the food which is blessed by the prayer of His word, and from which our blood and flesh by transmutation are nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh" (*Apol.* c. lxvi.). And again the language of Irenæus implies the same analogy between the bread of ordinary life and the bread from heaven: "For as the bread, which is produced from the earth when it receives the invocation from God, is no longer common bread, but the eucharist, consisting of two realities, earthly and heavenly; so also our bodies, when they receive the eucharist, are no longer corruptible, having the hope of resurrection to eternity" (*Adv. Haer.* iv. 18, 5).[1]

The Lord's Supper was not regarded as a sacrifice in the technical sense of the word by any of the church writers

[1] For other passages illustrating this same mode of speaking, cf. Clem. Alex., *Paed.*, I. 6, II. 2; *Strom.*, IV. 25. Origen, more clearly than any other church Father, enforced the distinction between symbol and thing signified, while the others were occupied with enforcing the analogy. Cf. his *Hom.* XI. on Matt. The words of Tertullian reflect the consciousness of the analogy, and yet of the symbolism: "Christus enim panis noster est, quia vita Christus et vita panis. . . . Panis est sermo Dei vivi, qui descendit de coelis. Tum quod et corpus ejus in pane censetur: Hoc est corpus meum" (*De Orat.*, 6). See also the passage from Gregory of Nyssa, cited *ante*, p. 489. For a discussion of these and other references to the eucharist, cf. Anrich, *Das antike Mysterienwesen*, pp. 179 ff. The emphasis placed by Ignatius upon *flesh* and *body*, in his opposition to Docetism, runs through all his Epistles. To his statement of the Rule of Faith, which strikingly resembles the Roman creed, he adds the words, "He ate and drank." Cf. *Ad Trall.* c. ix.; *Ad Smyr.* cc. i., ii.; also *Ad Eph.* cc. vii., xxi.; *Ad Mag.* cc. i., xiii.; *Ad Trall.* cc. ii., viii.; *Ad Phil.* cc. iv., v.; *Ad Smyr.* cc. i., ii., iii., v., vi. Irenæus employs the same argument, — the Eucharist is "the consistent declaration of the fellowship and union of the flesh and spirit" (C. *Haer.*, iv. 18, 5). For the general character of Ignatius' theology, his conception of Christ, his use of the term 'flesh,' and, in a word, his personal religious attitude, cf. Von der Goltz, *Ignatius von Antiochien, als Christ und Theolog.*

of the first three centuries, with the exception of Cyprian, the bishop of Carthage. In the language of common life, upon which the Jewish and heathen conceptions of sacrifice had left a certain imprint, they indeed spoke of the bread and wine furnished for the agape as an offering or oblation (*θυσία, ἀναφορά, προσφορά, sacrificium, oblatio*), but there was also contained in this use of familiar words an accommodation to a higher conception of sacrifice and always a protest implied against the lower conception. They seem also to have been aware of the ambiguity of language, as well as the danger of its perversion, and guarded against the danger by explicit statements of the true nature of sacrifice. The only sacrifice acceptable to God, they were agreed in holding, is a heart consecrated to God, obedience, righteousness, and prayer, which only a spiritual priesthood can offer. If in one place Justin Martyr speaks of the Christians "who in every place offer sacrifices to Him, that is the bread of the eucharist and the cup of the eucharist,"[1] he elsewhere explains, "Now, that prayers and giving of thanks, when offered by worthy men, are the only perfect and well-pleasing sacrifices to God, I also admit. For such alone Christians have undertaken to offer, and in the remembrance effected by their solid and liquid food, whereby the suffering of the Son of God which He endured is brought to mind."[2] Irenæus closes his discussion of the nature of Christian sacrifice with a statement as beautiful as it is clear and comprehensive: "It is also his will that we, too, should offer a gift at the altar, frequently and without intermission. The altar, then, is in heaven, for toward that place are our prayers and oblations directed; the temple likewise is there, as John says in the Apocalypse, 'And the temple of God was opened'; the tabernacle also: 'For behold,' he says, 'the tabernacle of God, in which He will dwell with men.'"[3]

Still more emphatic is the statement of Clement of Alexandria:

[1] *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. xli. [2] *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. cxii.
[3] *Con. Haer.* iv. 17, 18.

"We rightly do not sacrifice to God, who, needing nothing, supplies all men with all things; but we glorify Him who gave Himself in sacrifice for us, we also sacrificing ourselves; from that which needs nothing to that which needs nothing; and from that which is impassible to that which is impassible. For in our salvation alone God does delight. . . . And neither by sacrifices nor offerings, nor on the other by glory and honor, is the Deity won over; nor is He influenced by any such things." [1]

There is, indeed, a certain difference in tone between the language of Clement and on the other hand of Justin and Irenæus, when speaking of the eucharist, or of oblation and sacrifice. The earlier Alexandrian School was content with the inward spiritual recognition of divine things, while Justin and Irenæus betray the Oriental tendency which called for the expression of the inner mood by the external act. But, speaking generally, the idea of sacrifice in the church of the first three centuries was the idealization or transfiguration of human life before God, holding it up before him as evidence of an inward appreciation and obedience, and more particularly the offering of the bread and the wine, in the Lord's Supper, as a thankful recognition of the union of body and spirit, wherein the spirit consecrates all food to the highest end, and earthly elements nourish the body, which in turn ministers to the consecrated spiritual life. Nor was this idea ever effaced from the Oriental liturgies, however it may be obscured by a complicated ceremonial. The doctrine of Cyprian, which constitutes the exception to this teaching, never gained a complete hold upon the Oriental churches. Cyprian combined a doctrine of Christian priesthood after the analogy of the Jewish priesthood, with a doctrine of sacrifice, also conceived after Jewish analogies. He does not guard against misinterpretation of his language as Justin or Irenæus had done, or qualify the popular use of terms by the statement of the spiritual principle. His language is literal and explicit and becomes the foundation of the Roman Mass. The Lord's passion is the sacrifice which we offer, — *Passio enim Domini sacrificium est quod facimus.*[2]

[1] *Strom.*, VII., c. 3. See also similar expressions regarding sacrifice, by Minucius Felix, Anobius, Athenagoras, Lactantius, etc., cited *ante*, p. 450.

[2] *Epis.* lxiii. 17.

III

The liturgy in the eighth book of the Apostolical Constitutions may be taken as representative of the worship of the Eastern church in the latter half of the fourth century. Two hundred years had then elapsed since Justin recorded the mode of conducting worship in the earlier church. The ritual in Justin's time was simple, and rubrical directions were few. What Tertullian had said regarding the mode of administering baptism applied with equal force to the administration of the Lord's Supper:

"There is absolutely nothing which makes men's minds more obdurate than the simplicity of the divine works which are visible in the *act*, when compared with the grandeur which is promised thereto in the *effect;* so that from the very fact that with so great simplicity, without pomp, without any considerable novelty of preparation, finally without expense, a man is dipped in water, and, amid the utterance of some few words, is sprinkled and then rises again, not much the cleaner, the consequent attainment of eternity is esteemed the more incredible. I am a deceiver if, on the contrary, it is not from their circumstance, and preparation, and expense, that the solemnities of idols or the mysteries get their credit and are built up. Oh, miserable incredulity, which quite deniest to God His own properties, simplicity and power."[1]

By the middle of the fourth century all this had been reversed. Splendor and impressiveness characterized a ritual which had become rich in all the accessories of worship. It had been the boast of the early church that it had neither temple nor sacrifice nor altar; it was the pride and joy of the later church that it could exhibit to the heathens temples and sacrifices and altars surpassing their own in all that makes a powerful appeal to the sensuous imagination. The formula of the earlier church had been that God stood in no need of sacrifices or offerings, and therefore it was unbecoming to present them to Him. The later church carefully retained the formula, but rejected the inference. Although He did not need them, yet were they acceptable and well-pleasing in His sight.

[1] *De Bap.* c. ii.

The transition from simplicity to a complicated and imposing ritual is difficult to trace, and the connecting links have not yet been recovered. There was no discussion of ritual motives, as there was of theological principles. The acts of councils throw but little light on the process whereby the change was accomplished; they may record conclusions, but do not reveal the process of their attainment nor the consciousness of their significance. The ritual of the church, according to the familiar comparison, was an underground stream, emerging, after the age of Constantine, in a powerful river, making a channel at its will, which no acts of councils can control, against whose current all resistance was in vain.

In the absence of definite information as to the successive steps of ritual advance, we must turn to principles whose working can be clearly traced, even when not confessed, acting like deep instincts with an unconscious influence. The first of these principles is the tendency toward dramatization of the Lord's Supper, as the most effective method of reaching the popular imagination. It was the last supper of Christ with His disciples that still remained the central point about which revolved the deepest Christian feeling. The other method of worship, the homiletic service so prominent in the early church, had gradually disappeared to give way for the ritual of the altar as including what was most essential for human salvation. To this rite the name of 'liturgy' began to be exclusively applied, although in its earlier use the word stood for any form of Christian worship or service. The tendency to dramatize the Last Supper began at a very early period, when the congregations having become too large to sit down at the table, the bishop and his presbyters surrounded it after the example of Christ and His disciples. But this simple form of drama yielded to another and different type, when the idea of oblation and sacrifice had been developed. The passing away of the agape became the occasion of a great transformation. In that simple rite the contributions of the people for the common table were accepted and blessed as offerings, and were known as obla-

tions. When there was no longer occasion for these contributions, the bread and the wine intended for the eucharist, as distinct from the supper, became invested with a new meaning and a higher solemnity.

In the Clementine Liturgy, as it is called, contained in the Apostolical Constitutions, it is manifest that these transformations have already been accomplished. This liturgy was a private compilation from sources which have not been wholly determined; there is no evidence that it was used as a public form of worship; or that it was intended as such; but it was the work of a creative mind which left its influence upon the church, becoming in its main outlines the type to which the Eastern liturgies of a later age conformed.[1] The time when it was set forth may be the latter part of the fourth century, or even earlier. It may be taken as the picture of the worship in the great see of Antioch, in the age of the Emperor Constantius. Its theology is somewhat uncertain; it reflects the influence of the Apollinarian heresy, with, possibly, a tinge of semi-Arianism, but its attitude toward Christ is reverential in the highest degree. It is given as following a service for the consecration of a bishop, and its opening rubrical directions suggest a scene where preparation is made for some great solemnity:

"Let the children stand at the reading-desk and let a deacon stand by them that they be not disorderly. Let the deacons walk about and watch the men and the women that no tumult be made, and that no one nod, or whisper, or slumber. Let the deacons stand at the doors of the men and the sub-deacons at those of the women, that no one go out nor a door be opened even for one of the faithful at the time of the oblation. But let one of the deacons bring water to wash the hands of the priests, which is a symbol of the purity of the souls that are devoted to God."

The injunction is then given by the deacons for the departure of the unbelievers, the catechumens, the penitents, and the hearers; the faithful who remain are exhorted to

[1] On the identification of the compiler of the Clementine liturgy with the pseudo-Ignatius, who was the author of the Longer Greek Recension of the Ignatian Epistles, cf. Brightman, *Liturgies, Eastern and Western*, pp. xxvii ff.

have nothing against any one, to come in sincerity, and to stand upright before the Lord with fear and trembling to make the offering:

"Then let the deacons bring the gifts of bread and wine to the bishop at the altar, and let the presbyters stand at his right hand and at his left as disciples stand before the Master. But let two of the deacons on each side of the altar hold a fan made of some thin membrane, and let them silently drive away the small animals that fly about, that they come not near the cups. Let the High Priest pray by himself, and let him put on his shining garment and stand at the altar and make the sign of the cross upon his forehead with his hand."

At this point begins what in the Greek liturgies is known as the Anaphora, the *Sursum Corda*[1] of the Latin Mass:

"Let the High Priest say: The grace of Almighty God, and the love of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost be with you all; to which all the people are to respond with one voice, And with thy spirit. The High Priest: Lift up your mind; and the people: We lift it up unto the Lord. The Priest: Let us give thanks unto our Lord God; the people: It is meet and right so to do. Then let the High Priest say: It is very meet and right before all things to sing an hymn to Thee, who art the true God, who art before all things, from whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named."

Such is the beginning of the long prayer,[2] which with-

[1] "One result seems to follow from the comparison between one copy of these liturgies and another; it is this, that we must look to the Anaphora in each, commencing with the Apostolic Benediction and concluding with the Lord's Prayer, as containing the only ancient parts of the service" (Swainson, *The Greek Liturgies*, p. xliii).

[2] That prayer in the early church was to a certain extent the free utterance of the impassioned heart must be inferred from the language of the *Didache* (c. x.), where it is said that the prophets are permitted to give thanks as much as they will, *εὐχαριστεῖν ὅσα θέλουσιν*; also from the allusion of Justin (*Apol.* c. lxvii.), where the president is said to offer prayers according to his ability, *ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ*. In the Clementine liturgy, says Brightman (p. xxxiii), "Liturgical formulæ are not regarded by the compiler as rigidly fixed; . . . at some points he gives only the drift of the prayers without prescribing a formula." Cf. also Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, p. 171: "Le sacramentaire léonien donne lieu de croire que l'improvisation, ou du moins l'intercalation de phrases préparées par l'officiant lui-même, etait encore pratiquée au sixième siècle."

out any break proceeds to glorify God, in His wisdom and goodness and power, and then at some length and with much detail to commemorate the creation of the whole world, and the goodness which is revealed in its adaptability to man. The creation of man, the garden of Eden, and the Fall are next mentioned, and the beginning of the process of redemption. After the leading features of the Old Testament history in the successive stages of the process of redemption have been rehearsed, there follows the Cherubic Hymn, as the preparation for the recountal of the story of the Incarnation:

"For these things, glory be to Thee, O Lord Almighty, whom innumerable hosts of angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, principalities, authorities, and powers, with their everlasting armies, do adore, saying together with thousand thousands of angels and ten thousand times ten thousand of angels, — saying incessantly and with constant and loud voices, — and let all the people say it with them: Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Hosts, heaven and earth are full of Thy glory. Glory be to Thee, O Lord most high."

The incidents of the life of Christ leading up to His crucifixion are then given; He is glorified in His redeeming work as a preparation for the climax of the office, — the sacred words of the institution of the Supper, when He broke the bread and took the cup. The language of the prayer grows more intense and intimate in the intercession which follows for the living and the dead, till it finally concludes with the angelic hymn, the *Gloria in Excelsis*, the preliminary to the distribution of the elements. To the waiting congregation in the attitude of standing, the bishop in turn gives the elements, saying "The body of Christ," and the deacon gives the cup with the words, "The blood of Christ, the cup of Life." And while the communion is in process is said the thirty-fourth Psalm, and a more exquisite Psalm could not have been chosen: "O taste and see, that the Lord is gracious. Blessed is the man that trusteth in him." After the distribution of the elements, a shorter prayer follows, and the office concludes with the benediction, which has a tendency, as in later Oriental liturgies, to expand itself,

until it has been illustrated anew what the blessing of God may mean.

The most important feature of the Clementine liturgy, and also constituting its chief ritual innovation, is the oblation of the elements of bread and wine, after their consecration by the recital of the words of Christ at the institution of the Supper. The word 'oblation' had hitherto been used in a general and untechnical way, to cover the contributions of the people for the agape, or it had been applied to the sacrament also in a similar way, especially to the eucharistic prayer, as in itself a sacrificial offering. But when the distinction began to be made between the lesser and the greater oblation, the former became equivalent to what is now called the offertory, while the "greater oblation" consisted exclusively in the bread and wine which were placed upon the altar. Connected with it, was what is known in the Eastern church as the Great Entrance, when the clergy enter the church bearing the sacred vessels on their way to the sanctuary. The Little Entrance, on the other hand, and the comparison is significant for the change that has taken place, consists in previously bringing in the sacred books, to which is no longer assigned the pre-eminence. The prayer of the oblation runs as follows in the Clementine rite:

"We offer to Thee, our King and God, according to His constitution this bread and this cup, giving Thee thanks through Him that Thou hast thought us worthy to stand before Thee and to sacrifice to Thee; and we beseech Thee that Thou wilt mercifully look down upon these gifts which are here set before Thee, O Thou God, who standest in need of none of our offerings. And do Thou accept them to the honor of Thy Christ, and send down upon this sacrifice Thine Holy Spirit . . . that he may show this bread to be the body of Thy Christ and the cup to be the blood of Thy Christ, that those who are partaking thereof may be strengthened for piety and may receive the remission of their sins, may be delivered from the devil and his deceits, may be filled with the Holy Ghost, may be made worthy of Thy Christ, and may obtain eternal life upon Thy reconciliation to them, O Lord God Almighty."

In the earlier worship, the oblation, so far as that word may be used in a technical sense, was made before the

consecration of the elements; in the later ritual, it followed their consecration.[1] By this change, the Lord's Supper was transformed into a sacrifice, in the narrower sense of the word 'sacrifice,' or as it was popularly understood by Jews and pagans. In this respect the Greek mystery and the Latin sacrament agree, that they make the oblation of the consecrated elements the climax of the divine office. But at this point, also, of their closest resemblance, the widest possible divergence in practice occurs, indicating a radical difference in the manner of contemplating the eucharistic solemnity. In the Latin Mass, the priest elevates the elements after their consecration as a symbol of the sacrifice, an indication of the transubstantiation of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ; this is the moment when the congregation kneels and worships. In the Eastern church the most imposing moment in the service is not that which follows the consecration of the elements, but is connected with the Great Entrance, when the congregation fall down in the

[1] It is possible that the compiler of the Clementine liturgy may have drawn upon older material for the idea of the prayer of oblation. In the Anaphora of the Ethiopic Church Ordinances there is a prayer after the consecration of the elements, which contains the oblation, but not in such emphatic form: "Remembering therefore His death and His resurrection, we offer Thee this bread and this cup, giving thanks unto Thee for that Thou hast made us meet to stand before Thee and do Thee priestly service. We beseech Thee that thou wouldest send Thine Holy Spirit on the oblation of this church: give it together unto all them that partake (for) sanctification and for fulfilling with the Holy Ghost and for confirming true faith, that they may laud and praise Thee in Thy Son Jesus Christ, through whom to Thee be glory and dominion in the holy church both now and ever and world without end. Amen." Brightman, I., p. 190; cf. also *Die Canones Hippolyti*, in *Texte*, etc., pp. 48, 54. Egypt may have been the source from which the principle of the oblation came. But in the Antiochene worship as described by Chrysostom, whose time is contemporaneous with the compiler of the Clementine rite, it is doubtful whether there was a specific form of the oblation. But cf. Brightman, p. 474, for the reconstructed office in use by Chrysostom; Hammond, *The Ancient Liturgy of Antioch*, p. 15; Bingham, Bk. XV., c. 3. In the reformed communion office of the Church of England the oblation after consecration was omitted, as in the other Protestant churches. In 1662, the word 'oblation' was restored in the Prayer for the Church Militant, but as thus used it applies to the elements before consecration.

very path of the priests and worship while the elements are still unconsecrated and have not yet been placed upon the altar. The difference is profoundly suggestive. It can only be explained on the ground that the real transformation takes place in the mind of the worshipper, who recognizes in the purpose to consecrate in formal manner the bread and wine an antecedent divine action by which the material gifts of God, the food and drink, reveal the divine goodness and the divine life in the natural order. Out of this conviction had grown the sense of the value, the mystic importance of the Lord's Supper. In this popular reverence paid toward the elements of bread and wine, while as yet common food, there may be a trace of the earlier worship which associated them with the body of Christ, before the impressive ceremonial had been introduced, transforming the agape into the mystery of the altar.[1]

IV

The Clementine liturgy, although marking a great advance in the direction of dramatic worship, is still characterized by simplicity when placed in comparison with the later liturgical development. After the custom of the earlier worship, the sacrament was restricted to the faithful, and the distribution of the consecrated elements was conceived as an essential feature of every celebration of the Lord's Supper. In the later usage, these features disappeared. The rite was thrown open to the whole congregation, although the injunction was still repeated, which called upon unbelievers, catechumens, and others to depart; all might be witnesses, but for the majority of the congregation, there was no participation of the sacred elements. Again, the ritual acts and directions are few in number in the Clementine liturgy; no regulations are given for the entrance into the sacred edifice or for the bringing the bread and the wine to the altar; the long prayer flows on with no break in its homiletic unity and

[1] Cf. Neale, *Translations of the Primitive Liturgies*, pp. xxvii, 11, 109, 135; also Hammond, *Liturgies, Eastern and Western*, p. xxxvii.

impressiveness through rubrical emphasis or separation of its parts.

The liturgies continued to develop in the centuries that followed mainly on the line of what is called ceremonialism. The specification of ritual acts crowded out more and more the homiletic element, till the liturgies finally developed through the combination of dramatic and ceremonial motives, into an intricate religious service, whose meaning was almost lost in the bewildering maze of symbolic presentations. The ceremonial motive was the adaptation or reproduction of the court etiquette of an Oriental monarch, as the standard for symbolizing or dramatizing the soul's approach to God. Gregory of Nyssa in his treatise on the Holy Spirit has stated the principle in explicit language, and illustrated its action:

"Inasmuch as men when approaching emperors and potentates for the objects which they wish in some way to obtain from those rulers, do not bring to them their mere petition only, but employ every possible means to induce them to feel pity and favor towards themselves, clasping their knees, prostrating themselves on the ground, and putting forward to plead for their petition all sorts of pathetic signs to wake that pity, so it is that those who recognize the true Potentate, by whom all things in existence are controlled, when they are supplicating for that which they have at heart, some lowly in spirit because of pitiable conditions in this world, some with their thoughts lifted up because of their eternal mysterious hopes, seeing that they know not how to ask and that their humanity is not capable of displaying any reverence that can reach to the grandeur of that glory, they carry the ceremonial used in the case of men into the service of the Deity. And this is what worship is, that worship I mean which is offered for objects we have at heart along with supplication and humiliation."

When this principle was fully recognized and applied, it influenced every aspect of the ritual. It was as if the heavenly king were holding a reception upon earth present indeed although invisible, as the Oriental liturgies imply; present in the person of his delegates, the priesthood, according to the Latin conception. Whatever does honor to an earthly sovereign is therefore required on the occasion of God's worship, — the formal entrance to the sanctuary, which represents His presence, the imposing procession,

the magnificent vestments,[1] the accessories of light and music, perfume and color, and on the part of the officiants the punctilious performance of a religious etiquette. Great, indeed, was the loss and the injury when the true worship of the Father was obscured in its essential principles as Christ had given them. In this ceremonial dramatization of the soul's relations with God was an exaggerated formality incompatible with worship in spirit and in truth. But it may not have been without an educational influence. It was something that souls shut out from the presence or sympathy of the earthly sovereign were still able at their will to enter the presence of the King of kings. There was thrown around the worship dignity and majesty, as well as beauty and splendor, and religious functions were kept in accordance with good taste — so rare a gift that it might seem to serve as a substitute for piety. As it was the function of the bishop to regulate the ritual of the altar for his diocese, we may trace his influence as a mediator, in bringing something of the habits and environment of royalty, in whose presence he was accustomed to stand, to bear upon the elevation and refinement of the people.

[1] There is a reference to the dress of the clergy in the 37th of the Canons of Hippolytus: "Quotiescunque episcopus mysteriis frui vult, congregentur diaconi et presbyteri apud eum, induti vestimentis albis pulchrioribus toto populo, potissimum autem splendidis." But the caution is added: "Bona autem opera omnibus vestimentis praestant." In the liturgy in the 8th book of the Apostolical Constitutions, the high priest is said to put on his "shining garment" (λαμπρὰν ἐσθῆτα μετενδὺς). Cf. also Jerome, in *Ezek.*, c. 44: "Religio divina alterum habitum habet in ministerio alterum in usu vitaque communi"; also in *Adv. Pelagianos*, i. 9, where he remarks that it would not be an offence to God if he were to wear a comelier tunic, or if the clergy were to be dressed in white. For a discussion of these passages cf. Marriott, *Vestiarum Christianum*, c. iv., who concludes that the early dress of the clergy was not distinctive in shape, during the first four centuries, but was white in color; they honored the occasion of the sacred rites by putting on their best clothes. The transition to a distinctive dress in the Western church was made in the Middle Ages, when the clergy, having retained the ancient Roman dress which was in marked contrast with the prevailing dress of the laity, justified and explained the difference on the theory of its Levitical origin; c. viii. See also Bock, *Gesch. d. liturgischen Gewänder des Mittelalters;* also Macalister, *Ecclesiastical Vestments*, with literature in Appendix III., and Stanley, *Christian Institutions*, c. viii.

The deepest theological influence exerted upon the Oriental worship was inspired by the belief concerning the Holy Spirit, set forth by Eastern church writers in the latter half of the fourth century. It has often been remarked that the thought of the ancient church concerning the office of the Holy Spirit was left incomplete. In one sense the criticism is true. The Eastern church never gained the conception of the Spirit as working within the soul which has been fruitful in Western Christendom, and more particularly in the modern church. But none the less did its writers have their own peculiar conception of the Spirit's working, — a conception that was not lacking in definiteness and power. They regarded the Holy Spirit as the bond organically uniting the spirit within a man and the mysterious divine life in outward nature, — that nature which has a voice for the human heart, if only it could be interpreted aright. Hints of this conception are given by Cyril of Jerusalem, in his Catechetical Lectures, as, when speaking of the water of baptism, he says, that "whatever the Holy Ghost has touched is surely sanctified and changed"; or by Cyril of Alexandria, in his teaching that "by the action of the Holy Spirit the elements of bread and wine are metamorphosed into the body and blood of Christ." Gregory of Nyssa more particularly developed this conception of the Spirit, as having a close relation to the visible creation:

"The creation is guided by the Spirit, while the Spirit gives guidance; the creation is governed, while the Spirit governs; the creation is comforted, while the Spirit comforts; the creation is in bondage, while the Spirit gives freedom."[1]

The effect of this teaching was reflected in the Oriental liturgies, in the consciousness they reveal, that the sundered harmony between man and nature has been restored, in the conviction that the world is good, that the whole creation must be glorified before God in devout thanksgiving, as an essential condition of all true worship. After the *Anaphora*, the next step, says Cyril of Jerusalem,

[1] *Ad Simplicium*; cf. *De Bap. Christ.*

is to commemorate the creation: "We make mention of heaven and earth and sea, of sun and moon, of stars, and all the creation rational and irrational, visible and invisible."[1] A prominent feature of the eucharistic prayer in the Clementine liturgy is the emphatic and beautiful commemoration of nature, external nature and this visible world. The story of the creation is rehearsed in detail, and the beauty of the kosmos is acknowledged in eloquent language. God is praised for having beautified the world and for our comfort rendered it illustrious with sun and moon and choir of stars which forever praise His glorious majesty. The water is commemorated also for drink and cleansing, the air for respiration and for sound, the fire for our consolation in cold and darkness, the navigable ocean and the land with the animal creation, the sweet-smelling and healing herbs, the fruits of the earth, the order of the seasons, the courses of the clouds and the winds which blow when commanded by God. For all these things praise is given to Him in the eucharistic prayer, as though it formed an indispensable element in worship to acknowledge the glory and the beauty and especially the goodness of God in the visible world of external nature. So also Dionysius the Areopagite in his outline of the eucharistic office makes the hierarch first celebrate the works of God before proceeding to consecrate the divine gifts. In his own words or in those attributed to him:

"The commemoration of Thy gifts, O Lord, exceeds the power of mind, or speech, or thought, nor can human lips or minds glorify Thee as Thou art worthy to be praised. For by Thy word the heavens were made, and by the breath of Thy mouth all the supernal powers, all the lights which are in the firmament, sun and moon, the sea and the dry land, and whatever in them is. Things which have no voice by their silence, and those endowed with speech, praise Thee perpetually through word and song, because Thou art by nature good and in Thy incomprehensible essence above all praise. This visible creation related to the senses praises Thee, O Lord, as well as that higher intellectual world above the conditions of sensuous perception. Heaven and earth glorify Thee, sea and air proclaim Thee, the sun in his course praises Thee, the moon in its changes venerates Thee.

[1] *Mystag.*, V. 6.

Troops of archangels and hosts of angels, powers elevated above the world and above all human faculty, send their benedictions to Thy throne, sweet songs and pure, free from all earthly stain, joining all in one eternal hymn of praise: Holy, Holy, Holy."[1]

It is at this point that the Greek liturgy differs fundamentally from the Latin Mass, wherein no recognition is made of the goodness of God in the visible world, or the beauty and the joy of the whole creation. The Western world was a stranger, at the moment when the Latin liturgy was in process of formation, to the peculiar religious philosophy developing in Alexandria and Syria, that combination of theosophical and naturalistic tendencies in union with Christian ideas, which, issuing out of the old religions, formed a new mysteriosophy as it has been called, the basis of the Christian mysteries of the Oriental church. Hence also the Roman liturgy does not contain the Invocation of the Holy Ghost after the recital of the words of Institution, found in every Eastern liturgy, and regarded as essential to the mystic or sacramental transelementation of the bread and wine. From the point of view of the Greek church, the Roman sacrament of the altar is lacking in an element at once vital and indispensable. The Greek conception is more akin to the Protestant view, that asserts the necessity of faith in order to any helpful reception of the sacrament. In the Prayer to the Holy Ghost in the liturgy of the Armenians, we may discern the fuller thought implied in the more condensed forms of other liturgies:

"By Thee and through Thee, did the offspring of the patriarchal family of old, called seers, declare aloud and plainly things past and things to come, things wrought and things not yet come to effect. Thou, O energy illimitable, whom Moses proclaimed Spirit of God moving on the face of the waters, by Thine immense brooding and by Thy tender sheltering of the new generations under the overspreading of Thy wings madest known the mystery of the font; who after the same pattern spreading first the liquid element as a veil on high didst in lordly wise form out of nothing, O mighty, the complete natures of all things that are. By Thee all creatures made by Thee shall be renewed at the resurrection, the which day is the last of this existence

[1] *Liturgia, S. Dion.*, in Migne, *Patrol. Gr.*, III. 1125.

and the first of the land of the living." And again, in the form of Invocation in the same liturgy: "We adore and we beseech Thee, O good God, send upon us and upon these gifts here set forth, Thy coeternal and consubstantial Holy Spirit, . . . by whom blessing this bread and this wine Thou wilt make them truly the body and blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."[1]

The development of the Oriental type of ritual was still further influenced by the writings of Dionysius.[2] He conceived the two sacraments as vehicles of one vast mystic spiritual force, including in its common potency confirmation or the chrism, ordination, monastic consecration, and the unction of the dead. Under the influence of this supreme conviction, the usages of worship were presented as

[1] Cf. Brightman, I., pp. 417, 439.

[2] In the account which Dionysius has given of the liturgy of his own time it was still comparatively simple, and, with the exception of incense, did not differ greatly from the worship described by Cyril, Gregory, or Chrysostom:

"The hierarch, having finished his prayer by the altar, begins by incensing it, and then makes the circuit of the holy building. Returning to the altar, he begins to chant the psalms, all the ecclesiastical orders joining with him in the sacred psalmody. After this, the lesson from Holy Scripture is read by the minister; and when it is ended, the Catechumens, together with the penitents and those possessed, are ordered to depart from the sacred enclosure, those only remaining who are worthy of the sight and the communion of the sacred mysteries. Of the lower ranks of the ministry, some are standing near the closed doors of the sanctuary, while others perform some functions pertaining to their order. Those who hold the highest place among the deacons (leitourgoi) assist the priests in bringing to the altar the sacred bread and the cup of blessing, chanting at the same time, together with the whole assembly, the universal hymn of praise. Then the divine hierarch completes the sacred prayers and announces to all the peace; and when they have made the mutual salutation, there follows the mystic recital of the names inscribed in the holy diptychs. The hierarch and priests having washed their hands, the hierarch stands at the middle of the holy altar surrounded by those chosen from among the deacons together with the priests. After the hierarch has celebrated the marvellous works of God, he consecrates the divine mysteries and offers to the view the things celebrated beneath the symbols reverently exhibited. When he has thus exposed to view the gifts of divine power, he partakes of the communion himself and then invites the others; and when he has received and given to others the divine communion, he closes with a sacred act of thanksgiving. But while the common people have seen the mysteries under the veil of the symbol, he himself is led, always by the Holy Spirit, through spiritual contemplation, and, as becomes a hierarch, to the intellectual types of the ceremonial in their original purity" (*De Eccles. Hier.*, c. iii. 2).

parts of a great whole, and invested with a deeper meaning. Other church writers of this age, when speaking of the symbols of bread and wine, vacillated in their views and utterances, at times seeming to recognize the distinction between the symbol and the thing signified; and again apparently disowning the distinction in a desire to maintain that the consecrated elements were a perpetuation of the body of Christ, an avenue for the entrance into humanity of the life-giving power of His incarnation. But while Dionysius never lost sight of the distinction between the symbol and the higher reality, yet he interpreted the distinction in his own way, endowing the symbol with an independent mystic power, that made it indispensable to a true worship. In his thought, the symbol possessed a sensible or physical correspondence with the spirit, at once the evidence of the existence of the spiritual and also its representation. It was his aim to raise the initiated to a fuller conception of the spiritual truth for which the symbol stood. The priesthood shares with the symbol in being one of the elements in a secret divine process, but is not endowed with power in itself to transmute, as in the Latin conception, the material food into the higher divine reality. The priest is himself but a higher symbol, and likewise the instruction he imparts to the people. The priesthood, the homiletic teaching, and the bread and the wine, — these three constitute the sacrament, all alike expressions of a secret, yet everywhere active, divine process.[1]

But the chief indebtedness of Oriental ritual to Dionysius lay in the consciousness he inspired or strengthened, that the revelation of heaven to the world, dimly foreshadowed in heathen mysteries, was opened to the Christian worshipper at every moment in the sacred liturgy. The liturgy was no human work, but an organic part of Christian revelation. All that went on in the worship of the church on earth was a reproduction, actual and

[1] "Die consecrirten Elemente selbst werden als Symbole behandelt. Die realistische Anschauung des Chrysostomus findet sich bei Dionysius nicht. Der Realismus liegt sozusagen in der Stabilität und Integrität des liturgischen Vollzuges" (Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, II. 437).

real in its degree, however imperfect, of the worship of the heavenly hosts. In the commentary of Symeon, Archbishop of Thessalonica, who lived in the fifteenth century, who was also a devout student of Dionysius, we have the interpretation of the Eastern liturgy, when its long development was at last complete. Some conception may be given, in the following condensed abridgment, of the spirit of Oriental worship:

"The descent of the bishop from his throne to begin the divine office is a figure of the condescension of the Son of God. The presence of Christ on earth, His manifestation even to His death and descent into hell, are represented by the priest going toward the West as far as the doors of the church. The deacons, standing by the bishop, typify not only the apostles, but the holy angels ministering in the mysteries of Christ. The coming forth of the priests from within the Bema after the recital of the opening prayers represents the descent of the angels at the ascension of Christ. At the Little Entrance, when the deacons go two by two in procession bearing torches and carrying the Holy Gospels, the priests following and chanting the invitation to worship, or when the deacon gives the invitation to stand while the Gospel is read, in all this is shadowed forth the resurrection and ascension of Christ. But the bishop in the procession is a type of Christ Himself manifested to the disciples. The nave of the church is a type of earth; and the holy Bema, or veiled sanctuary, is the figure of heaven. The doors of the Bema opening for the entrance of the clergy and closing again recall the words, 'Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and the King of glory shall come in.' The incensing the holy table figures the descent of the Holy Spirit. The signing of the Gospel by the bishop in the form of a cross with a double taper teaches the doctrine of the incarnation and the double nature; but when it is signed with a threefold taper, there is to be understood the doctrine of the Trinity. When Christ Himself is speaking, as in the reading of the Gospel, the bishop lays aside his omophorion, which is otherwise a symbol of the incarnation. The washing of the hands manifests the irreproachable purity of the hierarchy. In the Great Entrance which next follows, when there is full procession of readers, deacons, and priests bearing the lamps and the holy vessels, there is typified the second coming of the Lord in glory; and at the same time the burial of Christ who is to be hereafter the beatific vision. This is the moment when the people cast themselves at the feet of the clergy, worshipping the good gifts of God in the bread and wine. The bishop goes within the Bema, and the doors are closed, because it is not fitting that the mysteries be disclosed to the people. The bishop alone is without intermediary in approaching the holy table, and through him even

the priests must be admitted into the participation of the awful mysteries. The kiss of peace which is then given represents the love which exists in heaven. That the veil should be placed over the elements until the recital of the Creed indicates the necessity of confessing a true faith in order to see Christ within the veil. After the Triumphal Hymn has been sung, the celebration of the mysteries begins. When the words of institution have been said and the Holy Ghost invoked to bless the elements, then Christ lies upon the altar in His very essence, at whose sight the celebrant becomes bold for the intercessory prayer, commemorating also, at the time of the oblation, the Virgin Mother and the saints, who with the people are united by means of the one great sacrifice. There are other symbolic acts to be performed before the communion: the elevation of the bread, which is Christ upon the Cross; the commingling of water with the wine, a reminder of the water and the blood; the bread broken and placed crosswise, which is Jesus crucified; warm water added to the cup, a sign that the body of Christ, after death, still retained its life-giving power. In the exhibition of the elements to the people, the veil is still upon them, for it is not lawful that the people should gaze on them directly. After the communion, the symbolism points to the ascended Christ. Most of the people have not communed, for they are not worthy. And yet they should be sanctified, and their sanctification must be by means of material things, since the soul is united with the body. Therefore bread blessed in the sacristy, but not consecrated on the altar, is distributed to the congregation."[1]

V

The Byzantine liturgy is the national liturgy of Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem as well as of Constantinople. It is used also in Greece and Russia, Servia, Bulgaria, and Roumania. Even the heretical churches of the East have approximated its order. Its origin and the history of its growth have not yet been fully traced. There is no objection to the tradition that it received some influence from Basil and from Chrysostom, but what or how great that influence was is not definitely known. In its present form it is not their work, but the result of a long period of growth. There are many Oriental liturgies in some respects resembling and in others differing from it, but the majority of them are no longer in use, and their

[1] Cf. *De Sacra Liturgia*, in Migne, *Patrol. Gr.*, CLV., 273 ff.

origin and history are obscure. The resemblance between these liturgies may be explained by their indebtedness to some common source. As the ancient creeds have for the most part a common framework, because they are expansions of the baptismal formula, so these ancient liturgies have their common ground in the institution of the Lord's Supper. But the history of Christian worship, also, within certain limits, shows a tendency toward uniformity. As in an age when solidarity is the prevailing motive there is a tendency in fashion which leads to uniformity in dress throughout the civilized world, so in the matter of Christian worship it would seem that a common instinct drew men together, that they would fain worship alike, whatever their differences might be, — a conviction that there must be some right method of acceptable worship, incumbent upon all to follow. In this way may be explained the fact that the Byzantine liturgy has become the prevailing standard in the East, and that the Roman Mass has at last succeeded in supplanting other uses in Western Europe, where the Gallican, the Mozarabic, and the Ambrosian liturgies have either been prohibited or reduced to an occasional performance.[1]

The differences between these two rites have already been suggested, but they are so important as to demand further consideration.[2] The first and in some respects

[1] Anglican liturgiologists have maintained that the Gallican liturgy was derived from Ephesus, whence it was carried into Gaul. For a criticism of this theory, cf. Duchesne, pp. 84 ff., who holds that it came through Milan, which from the latter part of the fourth century took the lead among the churches of Western Europe. These Western liturgies, especially the Gallican and Ambrosian, show faint traces of an Eastern origin. Cf. Hammond, *Liturgies, Eastern and Western*, for comparative tables.

[2] Cf. Isidore of Seville, *De Libris et Officiis Ecclesiasticis;* Durand Guillaume, *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum;* Muratori, *Liturgia Romana Vetus;* Martene, *De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus;* Rock, *Hierugia, or the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass;* Bellarmine, *De Sacramento Eucharistiae;* Moehler, *Symbolik;* Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien;* Ch. Rohault de Fleury, *La Messe, Études archaeologique sur les monuments;* Hahn, *Die Lehre von den Sacramenten in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung innerhalb der abendländischen Kirche, bis zum Council von Trient;* also Herzog, *Real Encyc.*, XIII., Art. *Sacramente;* Art. *Sacraments*, in *Dict. Chris. Antiq.*

the most striking of these divergences dates from the hour when they had their origin, — a monument to the deeper moods of humanity in the great crisis of its history. The Greek liturgy is eucharistic in the fullest sense of the word, the expression of religious joy and gratitude, a sustained hymn of praise and thanksgiving, while the Latin liturgy is penitential, with an undertone of sorrow, and pervaded by a cry for deliverance from existing or impending evil. In the Greek liturgy, one is walking in the light of a revelation which diffuses happiness and peace; in the Latin, one is laboring under the conviction of sin, the sense of a divine law which has been broken. In the one, the attitude in worship is standing, as the proper attitude for receiving the revelation; in the other, the only position is kneeling, as becoming suppliants in sorrow and humiliation. The Latin liturgy retains, indeed, the *Ter-sanctus* and the *Gloria in Excelsis;* but while music can do much to neutralize its prevailing mood of depression, it cannot wholly overcome the penitential chant of the *Agnus Dei*, which is the very core of the office, nor the Psalm with which the Mass is begun: "Why art thou cast down, O my soul, and why art thou dispirited within me?" In the Greek liturgy the world is good, and God is "the good Lord and the lover of men"; the creation is in itself a subject of grateful commemoration and praise; but the Latin rite is silent about the goodness of the natural order and sparing of its epithets; its hope is in the undeserved mercy of the Almighty and Eternal God. The Greek liturgy is not wanting in expressions of repentance and in prayer for deliverance from sin; but sin is conceived as resulting from the feebleness of man, or from a want of true knowledge, — a weakness which the divine forgiveness stands ever ready to reinforce, an ignorance which the divine light must dispel. Humanity in its very feebleness is always making a mute but successful appeal to the divine sympathy. But in the Latin rite there is a suspicion of some deeper source of the evil and misery, the consciousness of wilful transgression of the divine commandment, disturbing the soul, difficult to reach and

to subdue, forever invoking penalty and inevitable consequence. The one liturgy has measured the depth of human joy in this world, the other has sunk its plummet deep in the waves and storms of human agony.

While these divergences may be traced in part to the constitutional difference in temperament between Oriental and Occidental peoples, yet there is also another cause to be sought in the influences of the time when the liturgies appeared. Although there are no liturgical manuscripts dating from the age when the liturgies are assumed to have taken form, yet there is no ground for rejecting the tradition that the liturgy of Constantinople is indebted to Basil and Chrysostom in the fourth century, or that the Roman liturgy received some impression, according to tradition, from the hands of Leo the Great, and of Pope Gelasius in the fifth century, and still later, from Pope Gregory the Great. It is significant that the Greek tradition goes back a century earlier than the Latin, pointing to a later liturgical development in the Roman church. The Roman use has not caught that spirit of triumphant joy and gratitude which the events of the fourth century produced in the Eastern church. Indeed, the victory of Constantine meant rather desertion and humiliation to ancient Rome. The building of Constantinople and the transfer of the Capital from the Western to the Eastern empire, meant victory and enthusiasm for the East, and greater strength and permanence of its political constitution; while, for the West, it meant the weakness of exposure to impending barbarism. Constantinople stood for the triumph of Greece over the city which had held her in bondage for centuries. The religious significance of these events is also important. The victory of Constantine as interpreted in the East meant that the long duel, as it were, between the heathen deities and the Christian God was over; that God had vindicated His power, and had visibly manifested His love and protection for His people. But heathenism in the West still had its stronghold in the neglected, abandoned city. Again, the triumph of Athanasius was mainly an Eastern victory, as was the controversy

regarding the incarnation. It was mostly Eastern writers, Athanasius himself, Basil, and the two Gregories, whose persistent energy and powerful eloquence, springing from deep inward conviction, at last won the cause so vital to the interests, not only of the church, but of humanity. Nothing in the history of the church ever went so deep in motives or in results as the Nicene victory. But in all this the Western church, for the most part, participated indirectly, as compared with its Eastern rival. The sense of exhilaration and of gratitude which is among the most powerful of religious emotions, the assurance of the loving care of God, the conviction that, after all, the world is good, sentiments which penetrate and dominate the Eastern ritual, are not unrelated to this external order of events in the processes of time.

When the Latin liturgy began to take form, it was Pope Leo the Great, if we follow the tradition, who is first recorded to have left an imprint upon it. But the time of Leo (440–461) corresponds with the evil hour when the barbarian general was marching upon Rome, with all the impending horrors of its capture. Leo went forth for its relief, strengthened by faith in the invisible presence of the Apostles, Peter and Paul. It was a great deliverance, wrought by God, yet manifestly through the agency of the priesthood, as represented by the bishop of Rome. With the age of Leo coincides the beginning of the Latin church in its independent career, as also the first assertion of the Roman papacy. The Latin liturgy bears the traces of deliverance from evil, but also a consciousness that the source of the evil still exists, and has not been wholly removed. In the age of Pope Gelasius, toward the close of the fifth century, there was another humiliation for the West, when the young Augustus resigned his crown, and Italy passed under the rule of a barbarian conqueror. In the century that followed, while the empire in the East rose to the height of its power under Justinian (527–565), the West was a prey to the hordes of barbarous peoples that swept over it in wave after wave of invasion. It was no creative mood, whether for liturgy or doctrine,

that such events inspired. While the East was eagerly receiving the philosophy of Dionysius, which reconciled man as a spiritual being with his environment in the physical creation, and the last vestiges of the old Gnostic teaching that the world was evil had disappeared, Rome was receiving, year by year, fresh lessons on the mutability and the vanity of all earthly things. Only the church of God remained for its consolation. We may recall the language of Gregory the Great as he looked forth from his retreat when the waters were at last subsiding, who may also have left an impression upon the Roman liturgy in harmony with his experience: "What is it that can at this time delight us in this world? Everywhere we see tribulation; everywhere we hear lamentation. What is it, brethren, that can make us contented with this life? Let us honestly despise this present world and imitate the works of the pious as well as we can."

Again it is a characteristic of the Oriental liturgies, that the divine action appears more prominently than the human. It is the power of the divine presence that operates in the transaction of the ritual, of whom the priesthood is but the mouthpiece. It is God who is the actor in all sacramental ordinances, while the priest declares His action to have been performed, or prays for its performance. In the office for holy baptism in the Russian church, "Form thy Christ within him" is the prayer for the candidate; or in absolution, "Behold, my child, here stands Christ invisible, and He receives thy prayer of penitence"; or again in ordination, "Not by the laying on of my hands but by the descent of Thy rich mercies is grace given to those who are worthy of Thee." "From the throne of the glory of Thy kingdom come and sanctify us, Thou that sittest above with the Father, and art here invisibly present with us," is the prayer that precedes the delivery of the elements.[1] In the Alexandrian liturgy (St. Mark's) the priest declares to his assistants, "The Lord shall bless and minister with you."[2]

[1] Bjerring, *Offices of the Oriental Church*, pp. 69, 91, 106, 118.
[2] Neale, *Primitive Liturgies*, p. 28.

One misses emphatic expressions like these, in the Latin ritual; instead there is the anxious importance attached to the action of the priest, as a delegate commissioned in the place of Christ or of God. In the Mass, the recognition of a divine presence in the rite is postponed until the priest by the recital of the formula of institution has brought down Christ upon the altar. Hence the petitions in the Missal where the priest prays exclusively for himself that he may be adequate to perform the divine mystery, are more numerous and specific than in the Eastern liturgies, and indeed in the original Clementine liturgy, they are wanting altogether. The Greek liturgies betray rather an anxiety for the people that they should understand and be inwardly impressed with the meaning and importance of the divine action. Hence their tendency was toward rhetorical fulness, the expansion of formulas by amplification until the wealth of their meaning should be disclosed. The Latin condensed the forms of absolution and benediction into the briefest possible compass; the Greek expanded them, until all that was involved in the divine forgiveness or the divine blessing should be realized by the people; as though God Himself could not act in the great transaction without the intelligent participation and sympathy of the congregation. But the words of the Latin liturgy do not, and were not intended to, enlighten the mind of the hearer or arouse his spiritual and moral nature; they are rather a mechanical means to an end, where rhetoric would be an offence and the expansion of formularies would only delay the great consummation. While the Latin liturgy, like the Greek, is dramatic in its construction, yet its predominant purpose is pragmatic, — the performance of a transcendent act. And to this end the words to be used by the priest require no emphasis to make them impressive. They are charged by their simple and rapid recital with supernatural power. In the Latin Mass the priest seems to stand alone, overawed by the majestic function intrusted to him by the divine will and condescension, supremely solicitous that he shall not fail to perform it aright through any hidden weakness of his own; in the

Greek rite, not only is God present though invisible, and Himself responsible for the transmutation of human food into a divine sustenance, but angels ascending and descending are witnesses of the mystery and Jesus Himself, the head and inspirer of the heavenly and the earthly hierarchies, is the confidence and support of the faithful. Angels also are not absent from the Latin rite, but their function is, when the act of transubstantiation has been accomplished by the priest, to bear away the new sacrifice and to present it before the throne of God.[1]

The difference between the Latin and the Greek conception of the sacred rites of the church, and pre-eminently of

[1] An illustration of the divergence in principle between the Latin and Greek rites is clearly seen in the offices of coronation. According to the Latin use the prince receives the crown from the bishop, who is delegated to act in the place of God, and who therefore appears in the transaction with a dignity which reflects the majesty of the King of kings. "Cum hodie per manus nostras, optime Princeps, qui Christi Salvatoris nostri vice in hac re fungimur (quam vis indigni) sacram unctionem et Regni insignia sis suscepturus." Or again, at the giving of the sword: "Accipe gladium de altari sumptum per nostras manus, licet indignas"; and at the bestowal of the crown: "Accipe coronam regni quae, licet ab indignis, Episcoporum tamen, manibus, capiti tuo imponitur."

In the Greek rite according to the Russian church, the situation is reversed; God is acting directly and the agency of the bishop is subordinate. The prince ascends the throne in the centre of the church as his first act, instead of the last, as in the Latin ceremonial — the evidence that the service which follows is an act of recognition of what the divine will has already ordained. While all around him kneel, even the officiating metropolitan, he alone remains standing. He himself places the crown upon his head, he takes up the sceptre, and it is he who makes the coronation prayer that he may be endowed with wisdom for his great work. The address of the bishop at each step is in the nature of a disclaimer of any priestly power in the transaction: "With this visible and corporal adornment of thy head is clear proof that Christ invisibly crowns thee head of the Russian Empire." And once more, after he has taken the sceptre: "God hath crowned this God-given, God-adorned, most God-fearing autocrat and great monarch Emperor of All the Russias. Take thyself the sceptre and ball of the empire, the visible image of the sole sovereignty over the people, given by the Most High for their government, promotion, and every desirable well-being." Only when all these acts have been performed, comes the priestly anointing, which in the Latin rite precedes the others. From a ritual point of view, the Eastern rite devolves the responsibility of the coronation upon the immediate action of God, and the Latin upon the priest who acts in the place of God.

the eucharist, is further revealed in the designation by which they are commonly known. In the Latin Vulgate, *sacramentum* is the translation of the Greek *μυστήριον*. Both these words are heavily and unmistakably charged with an antecedent meaning derived from the inner depth of divergent civilizations and cultures. The oath of allegiance in the sacred engagement entered into by the Roman soldier stands for what was most profoundly important in the consciousness of the Latin people, — the binding sanctity of engagements where the vital interests of two parties are concerned. On the other hand, the word 'mystery' had associations with heathen religions in their lower as well as their better form, with philosophical speculations also, grounded in the most solemn convictions of the Oriental mind. Two more characteristic words could not have been chosen, for representing and translating the varying apprehensions of the Christian faith. Transformed though they were by Christian usage, it was impossible that there should not cling to them something of the meaning and force which led to their adoption, or made their use necessary, in order that the heathen mind might comprehend the purpose of the new religion. At first these words were used in a general way, so that they included doctrines and confessions of faith as well as external acts and rites. But their application came for the most part to be restricted to the external representation of the faith in a symbolic ritual. The words 'sacrament' and 'mystery' borrowed, it is true, from each other, until *sacramentum* became to some extent synonymous with *μυστήριον*; but the difference between the present Latin Mass and the Greek liturgy still points back for its origin to the distinct conceptions embodied in these venerable words. In East and West alike these terms 'mystery' and 'sacrament' came finally to include seven distinct rites; but they also retained something of their primitive significance. In the seven 'mysteries' of the Greek church, there is implied a conjunction of the physical with the spiritual operated by the Holy Spirit; in the Latin church they still retain the char-

acter of sacred engagements as by a solemn irrevocable vow.

In its conception of the sacraments, as in its theology and its organization, the Latin church lays the stress upon the will as that which is most distinctive in God or man. From the time that Augustine's religious experience became the normal standard of Latin Christianity, this question of the human will and the divine will became the ruling issue in every department of ecclesiastical life. Not the nature of things, not the reason of things, was the ultimate appeal, but an infinite will whose decree was final, and a human will, endowed by the divine will with some superhuman power. To this question of the will, and its prerogatives, are chiefly owing the difficulties and the controversies about the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in the Latin church. The Greek church has not been troubled with an issue from which the Latin church has never been entirely free, — the question of what constitutes the validity of the sacrament. The problem was raised by the Donatists, who insisted that the moral character of the officiant must have some connection with the validity of sacred rites. The same question was raised by the action of Hildebrand when he practically occupied the Donatist position in order to enforce his decree of the celibacy of the clergy, and from that moment the issue became increasingly prominent in the Latin church. In the Protestant churches, so changed is the definition of the sacrament, that the difficulties regarding what constitutes validity have faded away, and the question itself has become almost unintelligible to the Protestant mind.

A certain conception of the function of the human will combined with the Roman temperament — to which obedience is the primal virtue, and the desire for the enforcement of order the highest ideal — to give to the Roman priesthood from the first a peculiar character, fundamentally different from the sacerdotal principle embodied in the Greek ritual. Hence the Roman priest refused to be reduced to a mere machine in ecclesiastical functions, but insisted on the power delegated to him by God in order to

the valid performance of sacramental acts. In the Greek liturgy it is the power of God acting directly which constitutes the valid sacrament. This action of the divine agency culminates when, after the recital of the words of institution, the Holy Spirit is invoked to complete the mystic process. The absence of this invocation in the Latin rite makes the momentous instant to coincide with the utterance of the words *Hoc est corpus meum.* But unless the priest who recites the formula possesses some personal power which gives vitality to the language, he becomes a mere animated machine for the utterance of an incantation. In the Greek liturgy the responsibility is thrown upon God, the Holy Spirit; but in the Latin Mass it becomes, according to the prevailing interpretation, a heavy burden on the shoulders of the priesthood which claims to act, by the divine will, in the place of God. The question of the validity of orders, therefore, becomes of supreme importance. Whether the priesthood can be sure that it possesses the power is a point involving the validity of the sacrament. These questionings and scruples come to a focus in an issue, haunting the Latin church with a dread uncertainty which in ordinary times may not be apparent, but rises like a ghostly visitant whenever the discussion goes below the surface, or some vital consequence may be at stake. In ecclesiastical language, this difficulty is known as the *doctrine of intention.*

It was in the age of scholastic theology, when more distinctions were generated than the mind could receive or harmonize, that the question came up for discussion as to what constituted the validity of the sacrament of the altar. In the thirteenth century, when the papacy was in the plenitude of its power, and the priesthood also was fully conscious of its dignity and its mighty prerogatives, the formula of absolution was changed from a prayer to the positive declaration: "I absolve thee"; the dogma of transubstantiation was set forth for the first time by an imposing council; and the priesthood claimed the power of "making the body of Christ." This was the moment when the question was raised by the scholastic philoso-

phers, whether the priest, since he possessed this power, ought also to have a conscious will or intention to exercise his power. In the age of the Schoolmen the question still remained a speculative issue, and its consideration showed a certain vagueness and irresolution; but the tendency of opinion was to affirm the necessity of priestly intention, as elevating the priest above a mere puppet mechanically performing a ceremonial act. To this conclusion the influence of Thomas Aquinas contributed,[1] who with his master, Albertus Magnus, is the founder of the later Roman doctrine of the Mass, — that the consecration of the elements by the priest and not the faith of the recipient constitutes the essence of the rite.[2]

What had been a speculative question in the schools assumed a practical character in the age of the Reformatory Councils when heretics were multiplied, with whom it was an axiom that to God alone belonged the power which the priesthood claimed. In order to meet this growing scepticism, disowning with a special vehemence the power of the priest in the sacrament of the altar, or asserting that an evil character vitiated all sacramental rites, the doctrine of intention was virtually proclaimed by the Council of Constance (1418), with the approval of Pope Martin V., in the condemnation of those who held that a wicked priest, if he used the due

[1] *Sentent.* IV., *Dist.* 6, *Art.* 2 and *Summa* III., *Qu.* LXIV., *Arts.* 8, 10.

[2] "Under the supreme authority of Aquinas, the doctrine of intention, which had been so long struggling for recognition, found a secure lodgment in the theological structure. Durand de Saint-Pourçain, who wrote about half a century later, treated it as an accepted fact that without intention the words of the sacrament are an empty formula. He illustrates the absolute necessity of a specific intention by a celebrated proposition, which has been authenticated by its adoption in the Rubrics of the Roman Missal. If, he says, a priest has eleven wafers before him to consecrate, and thinks there are only ten, but intends to consecrate them all, they will all be consecrated; if he intends to consecrate only ten, and fixes his mind on one to be excluded while he repeats the formula, then only that one remains unconsecrated; but if he does not exclude one, then none are consecrated, for the intention with regard to each one is imperfect" (Lea, H. C., in an article in *The Independent,* New York, Nov. 20, 1890, reprinted in *Mag. of Chris. Lit.*, Dec. 1890, which contains an important discussion of this question, with a full citation of references).

matter and form and had the intention of doing what the church does, could not perform a valid sacrament.[1] Again at the Council of Florence (1439) Pope Eugenius IV. reaffirmed more positively the principle that the absence of intention made the sacrament imperfect.[2] But there were even graver difficulties in the way than the opposition of heretics who boldly denied the church's teaching. In the age of the Reformation the spirit of doubt had so far invaded the church itself that Latin theologians were in a quandary, whether it were safer to affirm or deny the doctrine of intention. On the one hand, the church itself was distrustful of its priesthood because of the existence of a Protestant sympathy within its fold. If intention were necessary and if the priest had the power to withhold his intention or had become sceptical about the mystery of the altar, it lay also in his power to invalidate the sacraments upon which the existence of the church depended. Who could tell, so long as the priest was silent, whether intention were present or absent? The conviction was in the air that the faith of the believer gave value to sacramental acts. It might then, at least, be inopportune at a time when a large part of Western Christendom had already broken away from the papal fold to reassert the doctrine of intention. At the Council of Trent the bishop of Minori urged the bishops assembled to abandon the doctrine. He gave a picture of the results that might follow if the doctrine were affirmed. There might be a knavish priest who had no intention to administer true baptism to a child who should afterwards become a bishop in some large city and there ordain a large number of the clergy. Since he was not baptized, he is not ordained, nor are they ordained who are promoted by him. In that great city, therefore, there will be neither eucharist nor confession, millions of nullities of sacraments by the malice of one minister in one act only.[3] On the other

[1] Cf. Harduin, *Coll. Conc.*, VIII. 915.

[2] Harduin, *Coll. Conc.*, IX. 438.

[3] Cf. Sarpi, *History of the Council of Trent* (Eng. Trans. by Brent), II., pp. 240 ff.

hand, in the Catholic reaction led by the Jesuits, who pushed every Latin tendency to its logical conclusion, the doctrine that the priest must exercise his intention was a vital one for the restoration of his waning importance. Such was the dilemma to which the Latin church was reduced in the time of its extremity. Under these circumstances the Council of Trent took the most prudent action which the exigency permitted. It did not affirm the doctrine, but it anathematized those who denied it: "If any one shall say, that, in ministers, whilst they effect and confer the sacraments, there is not required the intention at least of doing what the Church does, let him be anathema."[1]

The difficulties attending the study of the ancient liturgies are so great as to seem almost insuperable. To secure accurate texts is the first step as well as of highest importance. But in order to their comparative study after the texts have been obtained, qualifications are called for in the student which are rarely found in combination. Those who are otherwise fitted for the task lack interest in its pursuit, while those who cultivate an interest in liturgiology are too often wanting in the severe training, the ample knowledge, the wide sympathy, which the subject demands. None the less is the subject an important one. In the search for truth, the inquiry into the meaning of creeds and doctrines is but part of the process to which we are called if we would do justice to the contents of the Christian soul in the historical development of the Christian faith. But even on the surface of their investigation, the ancient liturgies have much to offer. All alike, those in use and those neglected and forgotten, contain the essence of Christian piety, — the heart of man going forth toward God, with the consciousness of a divine response; the devotion to Jesus as the revelation of God in human form; the sense of sin, the need of redemption from its

[1] *Concil. Trident*, Sess. vii., c. 11: "Si quis dixerit, in ministris, dum sacramenta conficiunt et conferunt, non requiri intentionem saltem faciendi quod facit ecclesia, anathema sit."

misery and guilt, the assurance of pardon, the identification of the sinner with the sacrifice on Calvary as in some unutterable way the sinner's hope and confidence; the desire for righteousness of character; the weakness pleading for divine protection in the ordering of the world; the recognition of a brotherhood of human souls within the church; the need of Christian sympathy, of charity for the sick, the poor, and the unfortunate; the disclosure of heaven to this lower world and its close organic relation through faith in Christ with the life that now is, the sure conviction of immortality and of future blessedness; such are the positive elements finding expression in the ancient worship of the church, never wholly obscured or made inoperative by ritual congestion. In this worship there is a bond of connection, making the Christian world feel its kinship with the past, as it can be felt in no other way, as though we also were still sustained and invigorated by the prayers of the ages, so that when faith grows weak, there may be here a refreshment, the sense of oneness with the children of God in every generation.

The spiritual imagination which produced the ancient liturgies lost its creative power after the fifteenth century, since when there has been no further liturgical development. Just as work suddenly stopped on the great cathedrals, leaving them unfinished, as if the workmen had been called away to some other task, so at the same time the liturgies ceased to grow, becoming monuments of a past rather than teachers of a living age. They were rejected by the Protestant world, as incompatible with its spirit. So deep was the protest, so complete the condemnation, that they no longer possessed sufficient interest to become even objects of curious research. It is only within recent years that the attention of Protestant scholarship has been turned to them.

The causes for this neglect lie in their inadequacy to the higher needs of the modern world. The new age ushered in at the Reformation demanded an expression in worship stimulating to the intellectual and moral nature, inspiring man with courage for fresh conquests, for reclaiming the

whole world in the name of God. The Greek liturgies, were they to be reintroduced, might act on the modern world as an anæsthetic, checking the progress of humanity; for they have no word for the intellect seeking to understand God or interpret His ways with man. They represent Deity as indwelling in nature, but that earlier view of the Greek Fathers, which dwelt upon the divine immanence in the reason, they abandoned after the condemnation of Origen had secured the banishment of free inquiry in theology. Of the three reverences enjoined by Goethe, they acknowledge two, — the reverence for what is above, and for what is beneath, but they lack the reverence for what is within. Hence they do not appeal to reason, bent upon the endless search for truth. They make an ethical appeal indeed, but subordinate it to other issues; hence they do not rouse but rather soothe the conscience. They point to another world, and therein lie their value and power; but they do not impel men to demand the transformation of this lower world in accordance with the heavenly pattern.

But nothing which the Greek liturgies possess as in a symbol has been forfeited by their disuse. Hints of higher possibilities which they conserved have now ripened into actualities. Science has resumed the task of consecrating and redeeming the world of outward nature, by a deeper reading of its secrets, — those thoughts of God about which Dionysius dreamed uneasily, turning over in his mind the significance of the physical symbol. The poet Wordsworth has illustrated with almost divine fulness the meaning of nature, and interpreted its voice for man, — the fulfilment of the conviction of Dionysius and others that the Holy Spirit was the bond of communion between man and the world of external nature. In the ages when the liturgies were growing, the higher forms of art had disappeared. Above all, there was no poetry, the highest of the arts and the bearer of the revelation of the soul to itself. In comparison with Dante or with Milton, the poetic mood of Dionysius in the Hierarchies seems empty, as though he failed because his imagination had no concrete material for the construction of the fabric he saw as in a glass darkly.

There are other deficiencies in Greek ritual for which a hint must suffice. The liturgies were the outcome of a determined struggle to regain the earlier Greek conviction of the beauty and the goodness of the natural order, as the basis of religion and of life. Origen had been condemned because he bore witness to the evil existing in the visible creation. But the modern scientific mind, bent on reading the deepest secrets of nature, is not so sure as was Dionysius and others that there is no evil in nature, nor will it, in optimistic fashion, shut itself out from dark suggestions that nature may conserve processes that are immoral, or that it lacks the seal of perfection or of finished work. The conviction grows that nature is given to man as so much material whereon to expend his energies, lifting it to some higher ideal conception. The evil in man may have its reflex in nature, as though the creation were ordered to reflect the constant struggle for the victory over evil, whether within or without the soul. The growth of modern art, one of the deepest characteristics of the modern age, is inspired by the belief that the artist is endowed with a measure of the divine insight and creative skill, in order to the representation of things as they should be, and not as they are.

If the Greek ritual is inadequate, so also is the Latin. The Protestant mind has finally and forever rejected the idea that the priest, whether with or without the exercise of his intention, can "make the body of Christ." On that point the history of worship turned in the age of the Reformation. The Mediæval presuppositions regarding the spiritual life, whence proceeded the question of what constitutes validity in sacraments, are now so remote that they seem unintelligible, as belonging to some foreign sphere without relation to the life of the spirit fed by the bread of heaven. The superessential bread for which we pray cannot depend upon the question of the intention of a human priesthood. If there be transubstantiation of the bread and wine, it is wrought by the faith of the congregation, in the strength imparted by the Holy Spirit, taking of the things of Christ and showing them unto us. The

Greek ritual comes nearer the truth at this point, however liturgiologists may regard it as an incongruity, when the worship of the gifts of God as good anticipates their consecration on the altar.

It is possible that the Protestant world now stands on the eve of some transition, waiting for the manifestation of its full content in a consummate act of worship. It has been said that worship is one of the lost arts; but if so, it is not to be found by compressing the spiritual wealth secured by the Protestant Reformation in the providence of God into the moulds of ages inferior to our own. Rather must we go forward, taking all that the past can offer in so far as it can harmonize with a greater ideal, but reconstructing in some more comprehensive way the worship and the conception of the sacrifice acceptable to God. In this waiting moment there may be spasmodic attempts to escape the uncertainties of the hour by restoring ancient forms not without their charm for the passing moods of the soul. As in architecture, for want of a creative capacity there has been a return to the styles of other ages, so in ritual a similar tendency has been witnessed. But Protestantism has a future yet to be revealed, as it has also resources of whose significance it is hardly yet aware. What remains to be done is to gather up in one inclusive act of sacrifice all that these modern ages have contributed to the knowledge of God, to consecrate and transfigure in His sight all that the heart and the reason hold as inestimably dear and precious. From this sacrifice cannot be withheld any contribution made by the human mind toward the solution of the mystery of existence. The sacrifice will include every department of human interest and inquiry, — music, art, and poetry, as well as science, philosophy, and theology. It will include the life of the whole church in every age. It will be a Christian sacrifice, for Christ Himself will be the supreme offering of humanity to God, — He in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, in whom dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

The early Christian church had glimpses of such a

sacrifice: it was to be a bloodless sacrifice, a reasonable offering: the presentation of the mind to God with all that it discerns of the mind of God, the true, the beautiful, and the good. "The noblest sacrifice to God," said Athenagoras, in his *Apology*, "is for us *to know Him* who is the creator of the world and of man." "What then does God require," said another Christian writer of the same period, "but the worship of the mind which is pure and holy." This worship of the mind, wanting in ancient ritual, has been enjoined by Christ Himself, as when He urged the love of God with all the heart and soul and mind. In the light of this injunction, that the worship of the mind is essential as is the worship of the heart, is seen more plainly the meaning of those other words, which cannot be too often repeated: "God is a spirit; and they who worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth."

INDEX

Abelard, on the motive, as compared with the outward act, 413.

Agape, the, 517 sq.; in the description of St. Paul, 518; in the *Didache*, 519; in the Ignatian Epistles, *ib.*; its decline and suppression, 523, 524.

Ambrose, on Baptism, 405.

Ananias of Shirak, on the Epiphany, 471.

Ancyra, Council of, its canon prohibiting ordination by presbyters and chorepiscopi, 119.

Anglican ordinal, on the threefold ministry, 10.

Anrich, on the influence of the Greek Mysteries, 442.

Anselm, as illustrating the Monastic attitude in the Investiture Controversy, 221; influence of his *Cur Deus Homo*, 281; on the miracle, 336; his doctrine of atonement, 365.

Antony, Life of, 311; his letter to Constantine, 312.

Apostles, their functions spiritual not administrative, 25, 30; their restriction to the Twelve, 30; larger conception of their office, 31 sq.; their work in planting churches, 33 sq.; the picture of, in the *Didache*, 57 sq.; disappearance of the office, 98; writings falsely attributed to, 104.

Apostles' Creed, in its original form, 282; its historical interpretation, 283; its later additions, 291.

Apostolate, the, how regarded in the time of Tertullian, 98; as limited to the Twelve by Tertullian, *ib.*

Apostolic succession, 4; Irenæus' theory of, 94; Tertullian's theory of, 96; as formulated by Cyprian, 127; differing estimates of, in the Greek and Latin churches, 182; in what sense held by the Reformers, 274.

Apostolical Constitutions, the Liturgy in the eighth book of, 531 sq.

Aquinas, on the relation between the episcopate and the papacy, 222; on the sin of heresy, 224; on ordination, 249; on the miracle, 336; on indulgences, 422.

Arianism in the Roman Empire, 306 sq.; among the barbarians, 313 sq.

Aristotelianism, supplants Platonism, 360.

Arius, his conception of Deity, his tenets as given in his Thalia, 308.

Athanasian Creed, 318 sq., 323, 324, 459.

Athanasius, his book, *De Incarnatione*, 281; his persecution by Roman emperors, 306; the essence of his teaching, 308; his relation to monasticism, 311; on the Word becoming flesh, 459.

Athenagoras, on the nature of true sacrifice, 450.

Atonement, the doctrine of, in the age of the Reformation, 246, 352 sq.; in the thought of Athanasius, 355; as implying redemption from the power of Satan, 357, 358; influence of, felt, when not acknowledged, 389.

Augustine, on the teaching of the Donatists, 164; on the universality of the Catholic church, 191; on the miracle, 335; his influence upon the Latin church, 351; his *Confessions*, *ib.*; stimulates individualism, 352; on the Trinity, 362; on predestination, 363.

Augustinianism, in comparison with Calvinism, 370; in its relation to the idea of God, 377.

Bancroft, defence of episcopacy on the ground of its divine right, 10.

Baptism, 399 sq.; an essential principle of Christianity, 400; illustrated by Cyprian's experience, 401; changes in method of, 402; as administered by laymen, 403; in the name of Jesus only, 403 sq.; anony-

mous treatise on the repetition of, 404, 405; as accompanied by the catechumenate, 406; transition from adult to infant, 407 sq.; infant, as overcoming infanticide, 408.
Basil, bishop of Cæsarea, his influence on Eastern monasticism, 144.
Baur, theory of the episcopate, 16.
Becon, Catechism on bishops, 9.
Bede, the Venerable, on substitution in punishment, 414.
Bernard of Clairvaux, his devotion to poverty, 165; on the difference between the monastic and the popular devotion, 215.
Bigg, C., on pagan superstitions, 442; on the Lord's Supper at the end of the second century, 522.
Bishops, see *Episcopate;* controversy regarding, in the Anglican church, 8 sq.; their close connection with the deacons, 25, 26, 43, 50, 51, 108 sq.; plurality of, 25, 43, 60; growth of their importance, 51; their mode of appointment, 52; as drawn in the Shepherd of Hermas, 55; their function, 59; exalted by Ignatius, 62–64; alone to celebrate sacraments, 63; as the successors of Christ, 63, 64, 84, 87, 115; as the successors of the Apostles, 87; as the centres of unity, 66, 70, 117; at first pastors of the local churches, 70, 121 sq.; not synonymous with presbyters, 79 sq., 139 sq.; associated with deacons, 80; their connection with the Lord's Supper, 81 sq.; as financial administrators, *ib.;* in the place of Apostles, 88; as vouchers for the documents, 90, 97; as alone endowed with the Spirit, 103, 104, 129; as heads of dioceses, 107 sq.; their mode of appointment, 111 sq.; method of making, given in detail by Cyprian, 115 sq.; appointment of, by bishops alone, 117, 128 sq.; equal authority of, 123; persecution of, by the state, 131; as mediators between the church and the world, 133 sq.; relation of, to the monasteries, 144 sq.; opposition of, to celibacy, 162; expansion of their dioceses, 204.
Boniface, the Apostle of Germany, 151, 162; influence of, in reorganizing the church in Western Europe, 208; his oath of allegiance to the pope, 209.
Book of Common Prayer, 426.
Bornemann, definition of the miracle, 336.
Breviary, the book of the monastery, 178, 516.
Brothers of the Common Life, 239.
Buddhism, its rejection of the miracle, 341.
Burial, custom of, 487.
Bushnell, on the Vicarious Sacrifice, 373.

Cæsarea, the creed of the church in, 286.
Calvin, 246, 249; on the government of the church, 271; on the doctrine of the Trinity, 329.
Calvinism, as the antagonist of absolutism, 370.
Campbell, J. McLeod, on the atonement, 371.
Canon Law, the, Jerome's statement on episcopacy, cited from, 7, 8.
Canon of the Mass, a popular service, 178.
Canon of the New Testament, 89, 93.
Canons of Hippolytus, their form for making bishops and presbyters, 120.
Catechumenate, importance of as related to baptism, 405; as yielding to the penitential system, 409.
Catholic, first use of the term, 102; claimed by the West, 148.
Catholicism, as defined in standards of the English church, 273, and in other Protestant churches, *ib.;* claimed by the Reformers, 273.
Catholicity, popular use of the term, 1; Protestant claim to, 3 sq.; in some of its aspects a Latin creation, 182; as defined by the Roman church, 235; its authoritative historical definition, 327.
Celibacy, in the Eastern church, 161; its enforcement in the West by monastic influence, 162 sq.
Ceremonialism, principle of, 539.
Chalcedon, Council of, action on the Roman claim, 193; definition of the two natures, 376; its decision reversed by dialectic, 473.
Charlemagne, as Roman Emperor, 198; his view of the relation between church and state, 210.

Cherbuliez, on the emancipation of man from nature, 339.
Chilpéric, on the wealth of the bishops, 205.
Chorepiscopi, the, suppression of, 108, 130.
Christ, as the Son coequal with the Father, 308; the person of, 382 sq.; as the teacher, 385, 386.
Christian ministry, the, historical survey of, 5 sq.; classification of New Testament writings in their relation to its origin, 21, 22; as presented in the epistles of St. Paul, 23 sq.
Christian year, the, 466 sq.
Christianity, extension of, 2.
Christmas, date of its origin, 470; why it came so late, 471.
Chrysostom, on Acts vi., 26.
Church, R. W., on the influence of Christianity in building up Greek nationality, 184; on the place of the episcopate in history, 228.
Clement of Alexandria, on the grades of the ministry, 115; on Egyptian worship, 451; on the Lord's Supper, 522; on the nature of sacrifice, 530.
Clement of Rome, 46–54; appealed to by Corinth, 47; enjoins obedience, 47; compares clergy to Old Testament priests, 48 sq.; on transmission of authority, 50, 51; criticism of his theory, 52 sq.; compared with Ignatius, 63 n. 1, 67 n. 1.
Clementine writings, on James, 75 n. 3.
Clergy, separation of, from laity, 124 sq.; identified with Jewish priesthood, 48, 124 sq.
Clovis, relation of, to the episcopate, 204.
Clugny, 161 sq.
Coleridge, S. T., on the use of 'Catholic,' 274; on the sacraments, 400.
Confessional, the, 410, 412.
Confirmation, different views of, in Greek and Latin churches, 404.
Constance, Council of, its relation to nationality, 228 sq.; as reflecting opinion in regard to the organization of the church, 236.
Constantine the Great, significance of his victory for Christian worship, 550.
Constantinople, influence of its rise upon the Greek church, 183 sq.; First Council of, its approval of the creed of Cyril, 289.
Conybeare, F. C., on Ananias of Shirak, 471.
Coronation, difference in the Latin rite of, compared with the Greek rite, 554.
Corpus Juris Canonici, its citation of Jerome's statement, 7 n. 1.
Cranmer, 246.
Creeds, the Catholic, 279 sq.; silence of the, 392.
Cremation, as compared with the custom of burial, 487.
Cultus and mysteries, 2, 438 sq.
Cyprian, on appointment of deacons, 26; his theory of the transmission of power, 109; his direction for making a bishop, 116, 117; his theory of ordination, 118; his doctrine of apostolic succession, 118; his conception of the episcopate as constituting a solidarity, 123; his resistance against the Roman claim, *ib.*; his assertion of sacerdotal character of the ministry, 124 sq.; his view of the Lord's Supper as a sacrifice, 125; his attitude toward the state, 131; his strict dealing with the lapsed, 136; his treatise on the unity of the church, 186; his treatise on almsgiving, 251; his religious experience at baptism, 401; his conception of sacrifice, in the Lord's Supper, 530.
Cyril of Alexandria, on the person of Christ, 377; on the metamorphosis of water, 483.
Cyril of Jerusalem, his influence on the creed, 287 sq.; on the inward efficacy of external acts, 481.

Daillé, on Ignatius, 14.
Dante, on the nature of punishment, 418.
Deacons, see *Diaconate*; as described in Shepherd of Hermas, 55 sq.; in *Didaché*, 5, 8.
Decius, persecution of the church by, 131.
Denmark, why the episcopate was rejected in, 258.
Development, as applied to organization, 15.
Diaconate, its origin and function, 25, 26; Chrysostom's comment on the

received view of its appointment, 26.
Dictatus Hildebrandini, 235, 328.
Didache, the influence of its discovery on the question of church organization, 20; word 'apostle' in, 32; its value as showing the transition from the Apostolic age to the age of Ignatius, 57 sq.; date of, 57; conclusions from, 58–60; cited on the Lord's Supper, 518, 519.
Diocletian persecution, 132.
Dionysius the Areopagite, 497 sq.; his time, *ib.*; his personality, 496; reflects Neoplatonic influence, 497, 498; on the heavenly hierarchy, 499; on the ministry of angels, 502 sq.; on the earthly hierarchy, 504 sq.; on the mysteries, 505; his use of the name 'Jesus,' 506; on the nature of symbolism, 507; on the names of God, 509; on the nature of evil, 510; influence of, in the West, 513; on the commemoration of nature, in worship, 542; on the order of worship in the Eucharist, 544.
Discipline, 409 sq.; hidden cause of weakness in, 420; rejected at the Reformation, 425.
'Divine right,' 7, 10, 11, 13.
Docetism, the typical heresy of the early church, 445; its relation to the Lord's Supper, 525 sq.
Doctrine histories, their method, 394, 395.
Döllinger, on Luther, 429.
Dominicans, desertion of mendicancy by, 168; as the agents for exterminating heresy, 223.
Dorner, A., on the deistic tendency in Augustine, 362.
Dorner, J. A., on the teaching of Hilary of Poitiers, 313; on the differences between Greek and Latin churches, 362.

Egypt, its place in religious history, 453, 454.
Eleusinian Mystery, 467.
Endless punishment, 414.
England, its retention of the episcopate, 257; Church of, in the age of the Reformation, 265 sq.
Epiphany, festival of, 468 sq.; its interpretation, *ib.*; how regarded by Gregory of Nyssa, 469.
Episcopacy, controversy regarding, between Anglicans and Puritans, 7 sq.; change of attitude in defending, in seventeenth century, 13.
Episcopate, the, theories regarding the origin of, 67 sq., 72 sq.; plural, 43, 53, 60; Ignatian, 61 sq.; monarchical, 66–68; Ignatian, a local office, 70; Ignatian, compared with that of James, 76; theory that it arose by localization of the Apostles, 77 sq.; its identification with the presbyterate, 79 sq.; Jerome's theory of, 79; the, influence upon of the formation of the Canon of New Testament, 88 sq.; condition of, in the age of Cyprian, 107 sq.; diocesan, development of, 121 sq.; its efficiency as affected by monasticism, in the Eastern church, 144, 214; not one of the creative factors of the Mediæval church, 150; its struggle with the monastery, 160; its modification by the papacy, 177, 179; as the natural ally of the state, 180; its situation in the Merovingian period, 207; its distinctive characteristics, as compared with the presbyterate, 213 sq.; its work in the Middle Ages, 215; in its relation to nationality, 219; in the Investiture Controversy, 220; its relation to the papacy, 221; its failure as an agent for extirpating heresy, 223; its work in history, 226, 228; as represented in the Council of Constance, 236; its retention in the Reformation, 253 sq.; its association with royalty, at the Reformation, 257 sq.
Eucharist, see *Lord's Supper*; its early connection with the episcopate, 65, 82 sq.; celebrated by the bishop alone, 63; opposed to Docetism, 65; a picture of the last supper, 82, 115; celebrated by presbyters, 107 sq.
Eusebius of Cæsarea, on the accession of Constantine, 181; on James the Lord's brother, 74 n. 1, 75 n. 2.
Evangelists, their relation to the Apostolate, 40, 42.

Fairbairn, A. F., on the defects of Nicene theology, 305.
Forged Decretals, 212.
Francis of Assisi, his conception of his

order, 238, 239; on the motive of charity, 251.
Franciscans, the, rise of, 166; conflicts among, 168; their type of organization, 237 sq.
Frankfort, Capitulary of, 210.
Freeman, E. A., on the relation between religion and nationality, 189.
Froude, J. A., on the value of individualism, 157.

Gelasius, Pope, influence of, on the Roman liturgy, 551.
Germany, its relation to nationality, 258.
Gerson, his defence of the presbyterate, 236.
Gnosticism, its doctrine of the world as evil, 445.
Gnostics, the, influence of, on church organization, 88 sq.
God, change in thought regarding, under the influence of Augustine, 361 sq.; the fatherhood of, 371; change in thought regarding, in fourth century, 461.
Goethe, on the three reverences, 562.
Great Entrance, the, in the Greek church, 536, 537.
Greek church, the, as differing from the Latin, 182.
Gregory the Great, 147, 149; his action in consecrating Augustine, 208; influence of, on Roman liturgy, 552.
Gregory II., attitude of, toward Leo the Eastern emperor, 197; his relations with Boniface, 208.
Gregory VII., 162; sacramental theory of, 163.
Gregory of Nyssa, on the deification of man, 309; on the meaning of the Epiphany, 469; on the consecration of matter, 483; on the body of Christ, as related to bread and wine, 489; on ceremonial worship, 539.
Gregory Thaumaturgus, the creed of, 285.
Gregory of Tours, his conversations with the Arians, 315 sq.

Hall, on episcopacy by divine right, 11, 12.
Hardwick, C., on the Protestant Reformation, 278.
Harnack, on the early relations of bishop and presbyter, 19, 20; on Apostles, prophets, and teachers, 31; on Irenæus' doctrine of atonement, 357; on the significance of the reader among the Minor Orders, 105; on Cyprianic priesthood, 126 n. 2; on Augustine's view of the church, 359.
Hatch, E., on the organization of the church, 18; on the laying on of hands, 111; on the limitation of episcopal authority, 165; on the expansion of the bishop's diocese, 204; on the Eleusinian Mystery, 467.
Hegesippus, on the succession of bishops at Rome, 92.
Hegoumenoi, use of the term in Epistle to the Hebrews, 41; in Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians, 53.
Henry VIII., suppression of the monasteries by, 172.
Herbert, George, on the relation of the divine and the human, 381.
Heresies, relation of, to nationality, 190.
Heresy, as endangering the social order, 410, 433.
Hermas, Shepherd of, the ministry as presented in, 54 sq.
Hermetic Books, on the decline of Egyptian religion, 452.
Hesse, the organization of the church in, 249.
Hilary of Arles, 319.
Hilary of Poitiers, his teaching on the incarnation, 312.
Hildebrand, his enforcement of celibacy, 162; by means of Donatist principles, 163; his relation to nationality, 218; his conception of catholicity, 235.
Hippolytus, Canons of, cited on the Agape, 521.
Holy Spirit, the, as the inspirer of the prophets, 28; reformation in the name of, by the Montanists, 100 sq.; as the special endowment of the episcopate, 102; the invocation of, at the consecration of the reader, 106; His antecedent action in ordination, 110 sq.; function of, in ordination, 247; as the bond between man and external nature, 541; invocation of, in the Greek liturgies, 543 sq.; wanting in Roman liturgy, *ib.*
Homoïousion, significance of, 313, 314.

Hooker, on the episcopate, 10.
Humanity, deification of, 308 sq.

Ignatian Epistles, how regarded in the seventeenth century, 14.
Ignatius, purpose of, to exalt the bishop, 62 sq.; his references to the threefold order of the ministry, 62; his estimate of tradition, 67; his doctrine of the Eucharist, 65; his character as a man, in its relation to his purpose, 66; disclaims for himself any Apostolic authority, 67; exalts the bishop in his capacity as a prophet, 68; silence of, regarding the order of prophets, 68, 69; comparison of, with St. Paul, 70; his plea for unity, 71; on the connection of the bishop with the Eucharist, 84; on the Rule of Faith, 283; his subordination of the miracle to a theological motive, 335; on the significance of the Lord's Supper, 526 sq.
Incarnation, controversy regarding the, 376 sq.; Cyril's doctrine of, 458, 459.
Individualism, as the motive of the monastery, 156 sq.; finds expression in the doctrine of predestination, 352.
Indulgences, 419.
Institutions, definition of, 1.
Intention, the doctrine of, 557 sq.
Investiture Controversy, 219 sq.
Irenæus, his letter to Florinus, 92; on the traditions of the presbyters, 93; his doctrine of Apostolic succession, 94.

James (St.), the Lord's brother, 17, 33, 74 sq., 83; in pseudo-Clementine writings, 75; in Clement of Alexandria, 74; in Eusebius, 75; extent of his authority, 76.
Jerome, on the origin of the episcopate, 7, 8; on the names 'bishop' and 'presbyter' as synonymous, 10 sq., 79 sq.; on ordination of bishops, at Alexandria, 114; on the purpose of monasticism, 138; on the equality of bishop and presbyter, 139 sq., 177; influence of his principle of the equality between bishop and presbyter, in the age of the Reformation, 254, 267; his condemnation of the errors of Origen, 462.
Jerusalem, creed of the church in, 288.
Jesuits, the, their organization, 170; at the Council of Trent, 560.
Joachim, on the principles of the Eternal Gospel, 243.
John (St.), his relation to the origin of the episcopate, 78.
John XXII., on apostolic poverty, 168.
Judaism, in its opposition to nature-worship, 464.
Justification by faith, as operating, when not recognized, 359; the complaint against, 424.
Justin Martyr, on the Eucharist, 81; on sacrifice, 449; on the Lord's Supper, 520; on the Christian sacrifice, 529.

Lactantius, on the worship of God, 451.
Laurent, on the relation of the papacy to nationality, 227.
Laying on of hands, 110, 111, 116, 117; in Anglican and Roman ordinals, 121.
Lea, H. C., on the doctrine of intention, 558.
Leo the Great, on the significance of Christmas, 472; influence of, on the Roman liturgy, 551.
Leo the Isaurian, relation of, to the schism between Greek and Latin churches, 198.
Lessing, on the worship of angels, 503.
Lewis the Pious, the rebellion against, 211.
Lightfoot, *Essay on the Christian Ministry*, 18, 19; on the terms 'bishop' and 'presbyter' as synonymous, 19, 79; on St. Paul's call to the Apostolate, 34; on the ministry at the close of the Apostolic age, 45; on the claims of Ignatius for the episcopate, 64; on the relation of the bishop to the Apostle, 79; on ordination of bishops at Alexandria, 114; on the sacerdotal conception of the ministry, 126.
Liturgy, the, use of the word, 517; in eighth Book of Apostolical Constitutions, 531 sq.; the recognition of nature in, 541; the Greek, in its difference from the Latin, 543; indebtedness of, to Dionysius, 545.
Loofs, on the teaching of Anselm, 366.

Lord's Supper, the, 515 sq.; as related to the agape, 517 sq.; its transference to the morning, 521; not at first regarded as a sacrifice, 528, 529; dramatization of, 532.
Lothaire II., supported by the bishops against the pope, 211.
Loyola, Ignatius, 170.
Ludovicus, Cardinal, on the power of the episcopate, 236.
Luther, on the friars, 173; influence of his doctrine of justification, 252; on the doctrine of the Trinity, 331; relation of, to the Mediæval discipline, 421 sq.; on the freedom of the Christian man, 432.
Lutheran church, as expressing the German spirit, 429.

Makower, on the relation of church and state in England, 263.
Marriage, relation of the state to, 172.
Marsilius of Padua, on bishop and presbyter, 8; reference of, to Jerome's theory, 8.
Mary, the mother of Christ, 459; the worship of, 472, 487, 489, 494.
Mason, A. J., on Confirmation, in the Greek church, 195.
Mass, the Latin, differences between, and the Greek office, 548 sq.; pragmatic rather than dramatic, in its construction, 553.
Matter, the doctrine of the evil of, 445 sq.; its consecration by the church, 477 sq.
Maurice, F. D., on the value of nationality, 227; on the atonement, 371.
McGiffert, on St. Peter in Rome, 77 n. 1.
Melanchthon, the representative of the teacher, 245; on the episcopate, 253.
Metropolitan, the, appearance of, 129.
Milton, on the value of antiquity, 12.
Ministry, the classification of, by Puritans, 9.
Minori, the bishop of, on the doctrine of intention, 559.
Minucius, Felix, on the nature of worship, 450.
Miracles, historical significance of, 333 sq.; unconscious influence of, 389; modern difficulty with, 390.
Mohammedanism, its expulsion from Western Europe, 322; no recognition of the miracle in, 341.
Monasticism, 2, 137 sq.; as a return to the country, 138; relation of, to Montanism, 141; alliance of, with the papacy, 149, 155, 160, 162, 167; agency for converting Europe, 150 sq.; intellectual importance of, 152; religious attitude of, 153; contradictions of, 154 sq., 174 sq.; motive of, individual, 156 sq.; vows of, 158 sq.; independent of episcopal authority, 141, 160 sq.; in its origin a lay movement, 159; extension of its vow of poverty, 165 sq.; decline of, 167; its loss of living motive, 169; suppression of, 169 sq.; its vow of obedience, 170; its relation to life, 171; deeper purpose of, 175; influence of, on organization, 177; its type of worship, 178; its alliance with the papacy in exterminating heresy, 224; in its relation to the German Reformation, 239, 240; as related to the changes at the Reformation, 261 sq.; its influence relatively weak in England, 262; its treatment by England in the Reformation, 266; its leading types preserved in Protestant churches, 275 sq.
Monophysitism, as seen in theories of revelation, 380, 458; acceptable to the Eastern church, 472; its influence on the cultus, 484.
Montalembert, on the English episcopate, 154.
Montanism, a protest in behalf of the prophets, 100; issue with Catholicism, 103; suppression of, 104; its affinity with monasticism, 141.
Morison, J. H., on the office of Christ, 386.
Mozley, Canon, on resistance to miracles, not implying their rejection, 389.
Mysteries, the Greek, relation of, to Christian worship, 442 sq.; the Christian, 505.

Nationality, relation of, to organization, 5 sq.; influence of, upon the church, 6; its predominance in the Greek church, 181; as the supreme motive in the schism between the Greek and Latin churches, 192; as the principle of organization in the Oriental church, 200; as promoted by the bishops, 219.

Nature, in its relation to the miracle, 339 sq.; the appreciation of, in the ancient church, 493; under the influence of the Holy Spirit, 541; recognition of, in the Greek liturgies, 541 sq.
Nature-worships, revival of, in the Roman Empire, 446 sq.
Neoplatonism, 454 sq.; its relation to Gnosticism, 455; under Egyptian and Syrian influence, 456; its failure to become a religion, 457.
Nestorianism, 375.
Nestorius, connection between heresy of, and national aspirations, 190.
Netherlands, the, rejection of the episcopate in, 258.
Newman, on the Thirty-nine Articles, in *Tract XC.*, 473.
New Testament documents, classification of, 21 sq.
Nicæa, Council of, its canon for the consecration of a bishop, 205.
Nicene Creed, its original form, 286; the creed substituted for it, 290; characteristics of this substitute, 293; accepted by the Roman Empire, 326.

Obedience, chief Jesuit vow, 170; the means of freedom, 176.
Oblation, the earlier use of the word, 536; its technical use in Clementine liturgy, 536, 537.
Offerings, time and manner of, fixed by Christ, 48; made by the bishop, 52.
Old Testament, quoted as authority by Clement, 48, 50; cf. 59.
Opus operatum, the principle of the, 423, 490.
Ordinal, Anglican, preface to, 10.
Ordination, Cyprian's theory of, compared with that of Clement, 109; instances of, in New Testament, 110; absence of allusion to, in writings of the second century, 111 sq.; no light thrown upon, by Clement of Rome, 111; or by Ignatius, 112; in the *Didache*, 112; part of the presbyter in, 12 sq.; rule regarding, in Apostolic Ordinances, 112; possible precedent for, in Clementine writings, 113; method of, at Alexandria, 114; regulation of, in Cyprian, 116; objection of monks to, 139; acceptance of, by Western monks, 159; change in conception of, at the Reformation, 247 sq.
Organization of the church, theories regarding, at the Reformation, 6 sq.; in the present day, 15 sq.; differed in different places, 72 sq., 85; at the end of the third generation, 85 sq.
Origen, on the interpretation of the Apostles' Creed, 284; his view of the miracle, 335.
Origenistic controversy, the, 461, 462.
Oxford Movement, the, as showing a monastic tendency, 271.

Papacy, the, its rise and early opportunity in Western Europe, 145 sq.; origin of, a compromise, 148; allied to monasticism, 149, 160, 162, 167; as trustees of ecclesiastical property, 221; causes of its decline, 225.
Papias, consults the presbyters when collecting the traditions, 91.
Paris, Council of, its declaration regarding the mode of episcopal elections, 206.
Pastor, 40 sq.
Pastoral Epistles, date and authorship of, 22, 42–44; importance of presbyters in, 42; bishop and deacon distinct in, 43.
Patriarchal system, 216.
Patriarchate, not developed in the West, 146; contrasted with the papacy, 148.
Paul (St.), passages in Epistles of, bearing on the origin of the ministry, 22 sq., 39 sq., 42 sq.; his call to the Apostolate, 31 sq.; his appointment to the Apostolate, 33, 34; on the Lord's Supper, 518.
Paulinus, on the birthday of Christ, 474.
Pelagianism, 377.
Penitential Books, 410.
Peter (St.), his residence at Rome, 77.
Pfleiderer, on the absence of miracle in Buddhism and Mohammedanism, 341.
Philip the Fair, in his relation with the papacy, 224.
Photius, protest of, against the Roman church, 195.
Pirminius, of Gaul, his expansion of the Roman Creed, 291.

Platonism, its influence on the early church, 443 sq.; as undermining the principle of the nature-religions, 448.
Pliny, letter of, to Trajan, 519.
Plotinus, on the beatific vision, 455.
Post-Apostolic age, 46–60; literature of, 46.
Poverty, attempt to impose the vow of, upon the secular clergy, 165 sq.; papal interpretation of, 167.
Prayer, attitude in, 467; a free utterance, 534; of the oblation, 536; to the Holy Ghost, in the liturgy of the Armenians, 543.
Preaching and prophecy, relation of, 27.
Predestination, larger significance of, 426, 427.
Presbyterate, the, transformation of its office, 84, 87, 90, 94, 97, 108; as represented at the Council of Constance, 236; its restoration to equality with the episcopate at the Reformation, 250; at the Reformation, 256.
Presbyters, of equal authority with bishops, 7, 8; references to, in earlier New Testament writings, 37 sq.; in the second generation, 38–44; their first appearance in the Apostolic age, 37 sq.; as described in the Pastoral Epistles, 42; in the Epistle of Clement, 47; ordination of, 40; their functions, 40, 41; as described in Shepherd of Hermas, 55; how the true is to be known from the false, 55, 57 sq.; mentioned in *Didache*, 60; as successors of the Apostles, 64 sq.; as bearers of the tradition, 65, 84; the name used interchangeably with bishops, 79 sq.; their relation to the bishop in the celebration of the Eucharist, 82 sq.; change in the functions of, 84, 87, 97; their subordination to the bishop, 88 sq., 108; consecration of bishop by, at Alexandria, 114; forbidden to ordain, 119 sq.
Private judgment, as illustrated by Luther, 430.
Prophecy, appeal to, in the organization of the church by Ignatius, 68; employed by the popes, in the transitions of the Middle Ages, 198; its return in the age before the Reformation, 242 sq.; as supplemented by the work of the teacher, 245; in Jewish history, 269.
Prophets, their place as an order of the ministry in Apostolic age, 27 sq., 57, 61, 67 sq.; function of, 28, 29; St. Paul's estimate of, 29; their appointment of St. Paul to the Apostolate, 34; account of, in the *Didache*, 58, 59; as they appear in the writings of Ignatius, 68, 69; causes for the decline of the order, 98 sq.; their relation to Montanism, 100; succeeded by the Readers, 105; as not requiring ordination, 110, 111.
Protestantism, relation of, to catholicity, 3; not the antithesis of Catholicism, 272; its analogy with Mediæval monastic organizations, 275 sq.
Prudentius, on the birthday of Christ, 474.
Purgatory, deliverance from, 416 sq.
Puritans, their recognition of four classes of ministers, 9; their answer to Hall, 12; their theory of 'divine right,' 13.
Pusey, E. B., his opinion of the bishops, 271.

Quicunque Vult. See *Athanasian Creed*.

Ratramnus, treatise of, *On the Body and Blood of the Lord*, 439, 440.
Reader, the, last relic of the prophetic order, 105, 106.
Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticum, 330.
Reformation, the, influence of, on organization, 3, 6, 231 sq.; the fulfilment of monasticism, 137; cf. 164 sq., 173.
Reformed Church, in its difference from Lutheran and Anglican churches, 427.
Renan, on the rise of the Christian ministry, 17.
Revelation, threefold form of, 297 sq., 387, 396, 397.
Réville, on the time of the Pastoral Epistles, 22; on the use of the term 'Evangelist,' 40; on the sacerdotal tendency in Clement of Rome, 49.
Ritschl, on the origin of the episcopate, 17; on the doctrine of the

Trinity, as the principle of Catholicism, 331.
Roman church, its early influence, 95.
Roman Creed. See *Apostles' Creed*.
Roman Empire, influence of, upon Christianity, 1, 2.
Rothe, R., explanation of the rise of episcopacy, 16; his definition of the miracle, 391.
Rule of Faith, 89, 93 sq.

Sabbath, the Jewish, 466.
Sacerdotalism, in Cyprian, 124 sq.; in Clement, 126; in the Mediæval church, 241.
Sacramentum, the Latin equivalent for the Greek 'mystery,' 505; its significance as compared with *Musterion*, 555.
Sacrifice, see *Lord's Supper*; in what sense the term was applied to the Lord's Supper, 529.
Sanday, Professor W., on the primitive bishop, 70.
Schaff, P., on the miracle, 338.
Scotland, its rejection of the episcopate, 257.
Scriptures, the, as containing a divine and human element, 378 sq.
Seeley, on the modern state, 261.
Servetus, his denial of the doctrine of the Trinity, 332.
Seven, the, in Acts vi., 26, 50 sq.
Shepherd of Hermas, the, its date, 54; its enumeration of church offices, 54 sq.
Sign of the Cross, the, 491.
Simeon, head of the church at Jerusalem, 75.
Sinker, article of, in *Dict. Chris. Antiq.*, 474.
Socrates, 443.
Sohm, R., on the connection of the Eucharist with the rise of the bishop, 82; on ordination in the Lutheran church, 248.
Stanley, A. P., on the pope's posture at the Communion, 83; on analogies with baptism, 402.
Switzerland, its rejection of the episcopate, 258.
Symeon of Thessalonica, on the interpretation of the Greek liturgy, 546.

Taylor, Jeremy, on the origin of the threefold ministry, 13.
Teacher, office of the, 28, 29, 40, 42, 55, 57, 61, 120, 244, 245; allusions to, in Shepherd of Hermas, 55; reappearance of the office at the Reformation, 245.
Tertullian, on organization, 7; his statement of Apostolic succession, 96 sq.; as a Montanist, 101 sq.; on the priesthood of the laity, 126; on the sacredness of matter, 447, 448; on the water of baptism, 479 sq.; on the importance of the flesh, 492; on simplicity of worship, 531.
Theodosius, the Emperor, edict of, promulgating the Nicene Creed, 326, 327.
Transubstantiation, decline of its hold on the imagination, 241; denial of, 439, 440.
Trent, Council of, its decision on the doctrine of intention, 560.
Trinity, the doctrine of, 295 sq.; as a summary of divine revelation, 297 sq.; the proclamation of, as causing no schism, 302; its relation to Greek philosophy, 304; why it may not have been acceptable to Roman emperors, 306; its national significance, 314; as the principle of catholicity, 327; accepted as such by the Reformers, 328 sq.; in the Augsburg Confession, *ib.*; as set forth in Cranmer's *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, 330; significance of its denial by Servetus, 332.
Trullan Council, the Second, condemnation of Roman usages, 194.
Tübingen School, the, its view of organization as development, 15, 18.
Twelve, the, as distinguished from the larger Apostolate, 31 sq.; historical evidence regarding their activity, 33, 34; disappearance of, 37.
Two Natures, the, controversy regarding, 375 sq.

Unity of the church, principle of, as held by Cyprian, 186; as related to nationality, 201.

Verdun, Treaty of, 213.
Vestments, 540.
Vincentius of Lerins, his relation to the Augustinian theology, 320; as quoting from the Athanasian Creed,

ib.; his opposition to Augustine's teaching, 364.

Wesley, appointment of bishops by, 15.
Westcott, on Platonic idealism, 360.
Whitgift, ground of defence for episcopacy, 9.
Worship of saints, underlying principle of, 485 sq.
Wycliffe, on the function of the presbyter, 8; reference to Jerome's theory, *ib.*; prophecy of, concerning the mendicant monks, 173; on the property of the church, 252; as the type of English Reformer, 263, 264.

Zeller, on Neoplatonism, 454.

The edition of the Greek and Latin Fathers to which references are made is Migne's *Patrologia*. The indebtedness for translations is to the editions of the Ante-Nicene writings published by T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, and the Christian Literature Company, New York; and of the Nicene and Post-Nicene writings published by the latter Firm.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF JONATHAN EDWARDS.

BY PROFESSOR A. V. G. ALLEN, D.D.,
Cambridge, Mass.

In fcap. 8vo, price 5s.

'In many respects this is the best account we have of Edwards, and the most adequate estimate of his character, of his historical influence, and of the value of his contribution to human thought.'—*Spectator.*

'Never before has Jonathan Edwards been drawn with all the lights and shades of his mental and moral nature so faithfully and carefully put in.'—*Christian World.*

'Never before has his majestic personality been more vividly depicted, or his career and influence so broadly and firmly outlined.'—*Andover Review.*

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

The International Critical Commentary.

UNDER THE EDITORSHIP OF

The Rev. S. R. DRIVER, D.D., Oxford; the Rev. A. PLUMMER, M.A., D.D., Durham; and the Rev. C. A. BRIGGS, D.D., New York.

'The publication of this series marks an epoch in English exegesis.'—*British Weekly.*

The First Seven Volumes are now ready, viz.:—

Deuteronomy. By S. R. DRIVER, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford; formerly Fellow of New College, Oxford. Price 12s.

Romans. By W. SANDAY, D.D., LL.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford; and Rev. A. C. HEADLAM, B.D., Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford. Price 12s.

Judges. By G. F. MOORE, D.D., Professor of Hebrew in Andover Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass., U.S.A. Price 12s.

St. Mark. By E. P. GOULD, D.D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the P. E. Divinity School, Philadelphia. Price 10s. 6d.

St. Luke. By A. PLUMMER, D.D., Master of University College, Durham. Price 12s.

Philippians and Philemon. By MARVIN R. VINCENT, D.D., Union Theological Seminary, New York. Price 8s. 6d.

Ephesians and Colossians. By T. K. ABBOTT, D.Lit., Trinity College, Dublin. Price 10s. 6d.

(1) Of DRIVER'S 'DEUTERONOMY,' Prof. G. A. SMITH (in *The Critical Review*) says: 'The series could have had no better introduction than this volume from its Old Testament editor. . . . Dr. Driver has achieved a commentary of rare learning and still more rare candour and sobriety of judgment. . . . It is everywhere based on an independent study of the text and history. . . it has a large number of new details: its treatment of the religious value of the Book is beyond praise.'

(2) Of SANDAY'S 'ROMANS,' Principal F. H. CHASE, D.D., Cambridge, says: 'We welcome it as an epoch-making contribution to the study of St. Paul.'

(3) Of MOORE'S 'JUDGES,' Professor H. E. RYLE, D.D., says: 'I think it may safely be averred that so full and scientific a commentary upon the text and subject-matter of the Book of Judges has never been produced in the English language.'

(4) Of GOULD'S 'MARK,' *The Baptist Magazine* says: 'As luminously suggestive as it is concise and sober. The commentary proper is thoughtful, judicious, and erudite—the work of a master in hermeneutics.'

(5) Of PLUMMER'S 'LUKE,' *The Record* says: 'Dr. Plummer's work is, it need hardly be said, admirably done, both in the introduction and in the commentary. Readers will peruse with pleasure his treatment of the leading characteristics of the Gospel. The linguistic analysis leaves nothing to be desired.'

(6) Of VINCENT'S 'PHILIPPIANS,' *The Scotsman* says: 'In every way worthy of the series which was so well commenced with the admirable commentary on the Romans by Dr. Sanday and Mr. Headlam.'

(7) Of ABBOTT'S 'EPHESIANS,' *The Expository Times* says: 'There is no work in all the "International" series that is more faithful or more felicitous. . . . Dr. Abbott understands these Epistles—we had almost said as if he had written them.'

*** *A Prospectus giving full details of the Series, with list of Contributors, sent free on application to the Publishers, Messrs. T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh.*

The International Theological Library.

EDITED BY

PROFESSORS S. D. F. SALMOND, D.D., AND C. A. BRIGGS, D.D.

'"The International Theological Library," to which we have already learned to look for the best and most recent in the historical, literary, and linguistic study of the Bible.'—President W. R. HARPER, of Chicago University, in *The Biblical World*.

The First Six Volumes of the Series are now ready, viz.:—

An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament. By S. R. DRIVER, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. Sixth Edition. *Entirely Reset, and Revised throughout.* Post 8vo, price 12s.

Christian Ethics. By NEWMAN SMYTH, D.D., Author of 'Old Faiths in New Light,' etc. Third Edition. Post 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Apologetics; or, Christianity Defensively Stated. By A. B. BRUCE, D.D., Professor of Apologetics and New Testament Exegesis, Free Church College, Glasgow. Third Edition. Post 8vo, 10s. 6d.

History of Christian Doctrine. By G. P. FISHER, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Yale College, New Haven, U.S.A. Second Edition. Post 8vo, 12s.

A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age. By A. C. MCGIFFERT, D.D., Union Theological Seminary, New York. Post 8vo, 12s. [*Just published.*

Christian Institutions. By A. V. G. ALLEN, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass. Price 12s. [*Now ready.*

(1) Of DRIVER'S 'INTRODUCTION,' *The Guardian* says: 'By far the best account of the great critical problems connected with the Old Testament that has yet been written. . . . It is a perfect marvel of compression and lucidity combined. A monument of learning and well-balanced judgment.'

(2) Of NEWMAN SMYTH'S 'CHRISTIAN ETHICS,' *The Bookman* says: 'It is the work of a wise, well-informed, independent, and thoroughly competent writer. It is sure to become *the* text-book in Christian Ethics.'

(3) Of BRUCE'S 'APOLOGETICS,' *The Expository Times* says: 'The force and the freshness of all the writings that Dr. Bruce has hitherto published have doubtless led many to look forward with eager hope to this work; and there need not be any fear of disappointment. It has all the characteristics of the author's personality. . . . It will render an inestimable service.'

(4) Of FISHER'S 'CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE,' *The Critical Review* says: 'A clear, readable, well-proportioned, and, regarding it as a whole, remarkably just and accurate account of what the course and development of doctrine throughout the ages, and in different countries, has been.'

(5) Of MCGIFFERT'S 'APOSTOLIC AGE,' *The Literary World* says: 'A reverent and eminently candid treatment of the Apostolic Age in the light of research.'

*** *A Prospectus giving full details of the Series, with list of Contributors, sent free on application to the Publishers, Messrs. T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh.*

The Guardian says: 'These volumes certainly must be said to answer their descriptions admirably. The reader will find in them studies in the history of the Church in a series of short chapters which are always interesting and often very picturesque.'

Eras of the Christian Church.

EDITED BY

JOHN FULTON, D.D., LL.D.

MESSRS. T. & T. CLARK have pleasure in announcing the Serial Publication of 'ERAS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.'

Christians of all denominations have begun to understand that many of the existing divisions of Christendom had their origin partly in misapprehensions, and partly in causes which have long since passed away, and that the cause of unity will be most surely promoted by a calm and impartial study of the Church in its long and varied experience under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

It is impossible, however, for persons of ordinary leisure and opportunity to make a profound study of ecclesiastical history. It has therefore been suggested that a series of popular monographs, giving, so to speak, a bird's-eye view of the most important epochs in the life of the Church, would supply a real want, and this series is intended to furnish such monographs.

THE SERIES WILL BE COMPLETED IN TEN VOLUMES.

Six Volumes are now ready, price 6s. each,

The Age of Hildebrand. By Professor M. R. VINCENT, D.D.

The Great Western Schism. By CLINTON LOCKE, D.D.

The Age of the Crusades. By JAMES M. LUDLOW, D.D.

The Ecumenical Councils. By Professor W. P. DU BOSE, D.D.

The Age of the Renascence. By HENRY VAN DYKE, D.D. and PAUL VAN DYKE.

The Anglican Reformation. By Professor W. R. CLARK, LL.D., D.C.L., Trinity College, Toronto.

'These "ERAS" are histories that will be enjoyably read and easily remembered. . . . Professor Vincent had a great subject allotted to him, and "The Age of Hildebrand" is an altogether worthy treatment of it. . . . In "The Age of the Crusades" we have the prose version of a story familiar to most of us in the trappings of romance. Dr. Ludlow holds the attention of his readers. . . . "The Great Western Schism" is a bright and popular *résumé*.'—*Literary World.*

'By a bright, attractive appearance, by a very comfortable typography, by the participation of dignified scholars and experienced writers, this series is likely to enjoy a deserved popularity.'—*New World.*

The following Volumes are in preparation :—

The Apostolic Age. By J. VERNON BARTLET, M.A., Oxford.

The Post-Apostolic Age. By the Right Rev. H. C. POTTER, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of New York.

The Age of Charlemagne. By Professor CHARLES L. WELLS.

The Protestant Reformation. By Professor W. WALKER, Ph.D., D.D., Hartford.

Latest Publications.]

CONCORDANCE TO THE GREEK TESTAMENT. MOULTON-GEDEN.

A Concordance to the Greek Testament: According to the Texts of Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf, and the English Revisers. Edited by W. F. MOULTON, D.D., and A. S. GEDEN, M.A. In crown 4to (pp. 1040), price 26s. net; or in half-morocco, price 31s. 6d. net.

**** *It will be generally allowed that a new Concordance to the Greek Testament is much needed in the interests of sacred scholarship. This work adopts a new principle, and aims at providing a full and complete Concordance to the text of the Greek Testament as it is set forth in the editions of Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf (Vilith), and the English Revisers. The first-named has throughout been taken as the standard, and the marginal readings have been included. Thus the student with any one of these three editions in his hands will find himself in possession of a complete Concordance to the actual text on which he is engaged; while the method employed, it may fairly be claimed, precludes the omission of any word or phrase which, by even a remote probability, might be regarded as forming part of the true text of the New Testament On the other hand, passages disappear, as to the spuriousness of which there is practical unanimity among scholars.*

Professor W. SANDAY, D.D., LL.D., Oxford, writes: 'There can be no question as to the value of the new "Concordance." It is the only scientific Concordance to the Greek Testament, and the only one that can be safely used for scientific purposes.'

'It would be difficult to overpraise this invaluable addition to biblical study. . . . For all English students of the Greek Testament this great work is indispensable.'—BRITISH WEEKLY.

Prospectus, with Specimen Page, free on application.

DILLMANN ON GENESIS.

Genesis: Critically and Exegetically Expounded. By A. DILLMANN, D.D., late Professor of Theology in Berlin. *Authorised Translation.* In Two Volumes, 8vo, price 21s.

'The most perfect form of the *commentarius perpetuus* to the Old Testament which the 19th century has produced.'—Professor BUDDE, Strassburg.

'Dillmann's commentaries are inimitable works for labour and insight, for the mass of their contents, as for the thoroughness and fineness of their scholarship. They form an indispensable basis for all further works on the same subjects. . . . There is not a living scholar of the Old Testament but follows him to his rest with the deepest reverence and gratitude.'—*Bookman.*

St. Paul's Conception of Christ; or, The Doctrine of the Second Adam. Being the Sixteenth Series of the 'Cunningham Lectures.' By Rev. DAVID SOMERVILLE, M.A., Edinburgh. In demy 8vo, price 9s.

'By its keen and profound insight, by its sanity, and by its fulness of knowledge, the volume will at once take its place as the best authority on that department of New Testament theology with which it deals.'—*Critical Review.*

The Christ of History and of Experience. Being the 'Kerr Lectures' for 1897. By Rev. DAVID W. FORREST, M.A., Glasgow. In demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d.

'An exceedingly able treatment of a great and important subject.'—The late Professor CALDERWOOD.

'An eminently stimulating and improving book.'—*Glasgow Herald.*

'Displays marked ability, and possesses unusual interest.'—*Manchester Guardian.*

CHIC 67817

Recently Discovered Manuscripts, and ORIGEN'S COMMENTARIES ON MATTHEW AND JOHN. Being an Additional Volume to the 'Ante-Nicene Christian Library.' Edited by Professor ALLAN MENZIES, D.D., St. Andrews University. Containing: Gospel of Peter (by Professor ARMITAGE ROBINSON)—Diatessaron of Tatian—Apocalypse of Peter—Visio Pauli—Apocalypses of the Virgin and Sedrach—Testament of Abraham—Acts of Xanthippe and Polyxena—Narrative of Zosimus—Apology of Aristides—Epistles of Clement (Complete Text)—Origen's Commentaries on Matthew and John, etc. In One Volume, 4to (pp. 540), price 12s. 6d. net.

'It was a happy idea which occurred to the publishers of the "Ante-Nicene Library" to supplement that series with a volume containing translations of the more important discoveries of recent years. A judicious arrangement has been observed in grouping the recovered treasures. . . . It has been compiled with great care, and the Introductions are short and to the point.'—*Record.*

Homiletic: Lectures on Preaching. By Professor T. CHRISTLIEB, Bonn University, Author of 'Modern Doubt and Christian Belief.' Post 8vo, price 7s. 6d.

'Valuable for fulness of learning and thoroughness of discussion and suitability for practical purposes. And to many not the least of their recommendations is the fact that they give, within moderate compass, a reasoned statement of the principles which enabled the lamented author to make so deep a mark as a Court and University preacher, and as a Christian worker.'—Prof. JAMES ROBERTSON, D.D., in the *Critical Review.*

The Incarnate Saviour. By W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D. A New and Cheaper Edition. Crown 8vo, price 3s. 6d.

The late Canon LIDDON: 'It commands my warm sympathy and admiration. I rejoice in the circulation of such a book, which I trust will be the widest possible.'

The Ancient Faith in Modern Light: A Series of Essays. By JOSEPH PARKER, D.D., City Temple, London; Principal T. V. TYMMS, Rawdon College; Professor MEDLEY, Regent's Park College; Principal A. CAVE, D.D., Hackney College; SAMUEL G. GREEN, D.D., London; Principal R. VAUGHAN PRYCE, New College; S. NEWTH, D.D. (late Principal), New College; Rev. W. BROCK, Hampstead; J. GUINNESS ROGERS, D.D., Clapham; H. R. REYNOLDS, D.D. (late Principal of Cheshunt College). In demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d.

'These writers have passed their storms and found anchorage. They are the men who do the world's best work; healing work it often is, and will be here; saving work it will even be, for there is no dulness or dissipation that would weary the youngest reader. There is the living mind, fearless in face of the living problems of to-day; and the young minds who come to this volume will find rest to their souls, for they will come to the mind of the Master Himself.'—*Expository Times.*

Digitized with financial assistance from
Hemendra Kothari
on 06 November, 2019